# Afrofuturism AC

## PART 1 IS THE RESOLUTIONAL CONTEXT

I interpret the resolution through the framework of **science fiction**. Under my framing, the choice of whether to embrace or reject the production of nuclear power emerges in the context of the **Space Trader’s** offer in Derek Bell’s work of **afro-futurist** science-fiction. My argument is that producing nuclear power requires agreeing to the Space Trader’s offer. On one hand, Bell describes a dystopian future. On the other, this future is shockingly similar to the current status of the United States. **Bell**

1 January. The first surprise was not their arrival. The radio messages had begun weeks before, announcing that one thousand ships from a star far out in space would land on 1 January 2000, in harbors along the Atlantic coast from Cape Cod to North Carolina. Well before dawn on that day, millions of people across North America had wakened early to witness the moment **the ships entered Earth's atmosphere**. However expected, to the watchers, children of the electronic age, the spaceships' approach was as awesome as had been that earlier one of three ships, one October over five hundred years before, to the Indians of the island of Santo Domingo in the Caribbean. No, the first surprise was the ships themselves. The people who lined the beaches of New Jersey where the first ships were scheduled to arrive, saw not anything NASA might have dreamed up, but huge vessels, the size of aircraft carriers, which the old men in the crowd recognized as being pretty much like the box-shaped landing craft that carried Allied troops to the Normandy beachheads during the Second World War. As the sun rose on that cold bright morning, **the people on the shore, including an anxious delegation of government officials and media reporters, witnessed a fantastic display of eerie lights and strange sound**-evidently the visitors' salute to their American hosts. Almost unnoticed during the spectacle, the bow of the leading ship slowly lowered. **A sizable party of the visitors-the first beings from outer space anyone on Earth had ever seen-emerged and began moving majestically across the water toward the shore.** The shock of seeing these beings, regal in appearance and bearing, literally walking on the waves was more thrilling than frightening. At least, no one panicked. Then came the second surprise. The leaders of this vast armada could speak English. Moreover, they spoke in the familiar comforting tones of former President Reagan, having dubbed his recorded voice into a computerized language-translation system. After the initial greetings, the leader of the U.S. delegation opened his mouth to read his welcoming speech-only the first several speeches scheduled to be given on this historic occasion by the leaders of both political parties and other eminent citizens, including-of course-stars of the entertainment and sports worlds. But before he could begin, the principal spokesperson for the space people (and it wasn't possible to know whether it was a man or woman or something else entirely) raised a hand and spoke crisply, and to the point.

And this point constituted the third surprise. **Those mammoth vessels carr[ying] within their holds treasure of which the U**nited **S**tates **was in** most desperate **need: gold, to bail out the almost bankrupt** federal, state, and **local governments;** **special chemicals capable of unpolluting the environment**, which was becoming daily more toxic, and restoring it to the pristine state it had been before Western explorers set foot on it; **and a totally safe nuclear engine and fuel, to relieve the nation's all but depleted supply of fossil fuel.** In return, **the visitors wanted only one thing-and that was to take back to their home star all the African Americans who lived in the U**nited **S**tates. **The jaw of every one of the welcoming officials dropped**, not a word of the many speeches they had prepared suitable for the occasion. As the Americans stood in stupefied silence, **the visitors' leader emphasized that the** proposed **trade was for the Americans freely to accept or not**, that no force would be used. **Neither then nor subsequently did the leader or any other of the** visitors, whom anchorpersons on that evening's news shows immediately labeled **the "Space Traders," [never] reveal[ed] why they wanted only black people or what [their] plans they had for them** should the United States be prepared to part with that or any other group of its citizens. The leader only reiterated to his still-dumbfounded audience that, in exchange for the treasure they had brought, they wanted to take away every American categorized as black on birth certificate or other official identification**. The Space Traders** said **they would wait sixteen days for a response to their offer**. That is, on 17 January-the day when in that year the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., was to be observed-they would depart carrying with them every black man, woman, and child in the nation and leave behind untold treasure. Otherwise, the Space Traders' leader shrugged and glanced around-at the oil slick in the water, at the dead gulls on the beach, at the thick shadow of smog that obscured the sky on all but the windiest days. Then **the visitors walked back over the waves** back over the waves **and returned to their ships.**

## PART 2 IS THE ADVOCACY

#### The AFF advocacy is to stop both symbolically and literally trading African Americans in exchange for Nuclear Power. I defend the implementation of a post-fiat policy to ban the production of nuclear energy, but I defend the ban in the world of Bell’s science fiction. The only way to receive this source of nuclear energy is through the Space Traders, meaning the resolution is fundamentally a question of whether we should say yes or no. If we say yes, we are committed to trading all African Americans and being complicit in anti-black violence. If we say no, there’s no way to obtain nuclear power and the only way for the Space Traders to leave is to ban this energy form in its entirety. We must say no to the Space Traders. Bell 2

There was a definite split in the nature of the calls - a split that reflected distinctly different perceptions of the Space Traders. **Most white people were**, like the welcoming delegates that morning, **relieved and pleased to f[ound] the visitors from outer space unthreatening.** They were not human, obviously, but resembled the superhuman, good-guy characters in comic books; indeed, they seemed to be practical, no non-sense folks like regular Americans. **On the other hand, many** American **blacks**-whether watching from the shore or on their television screens-**had s[aw] the visitors as distinctly unpleasant, even menacing in appearance.** While their perceptions of the visitors differed, **black people all agreed that the Space Traders looked like bad news-and their trade offer certainly was**-and all burned up the phone lines urging black leaders to take action against it. **But whites, long conditioned to discounting any statements of blacks unconfirmed by other whites, chose** now, of course, **to follow their own perceptions.** **"Will the blacks never be free of their silly superstitions?"** whites asked one another with condescending smiles. "Here, in this truly historic moment, when America has been selected as the site for this planet's first contact with people from another world, **the blacks just revert to their primitive fear and foolishness**." Thus, the blacks' outrage was discounted in this crisis; they had, as usual, no credibility.

And it was a time of crisis. Not only because of the Space Traders' offer per se, but because that offer came when **the country was in dire straits. Decades of** conservative**, laissez-faire capitalism had emptied the coffers of all but a few of the very rich.** **The nation that had**, in the quarter-century after the Second World War, funded the reconstruction of the free world had, in the next quarter-century, **given itself over to greed and willful exploitation of its natural resources**. Now it was struggling to survive like any third-world nation**. Massive debt had curtailed all but the most necessary services.** The environment was in shambles, as reflected by the fact that the sick and elderly had to wear special masks whenever they ventured out-of-doors. In addition, **supplies of crude oil and coal were almost exhausted.** The Space Traders' offer had come just in time to rescue America. Though few gave voice to their thoughts, **many were thinking that the trade offer was, indeed, the ultimate solution to the nation's troubles**. 2 January. The insomnia that kept the American people tossing and turning that first night of the new century did not spare the White House. **As soon as the President[‘s] heard the Space Traders'** post-arrival **proposition** on television, **his political instincts immediately locked into place. This was big!** And it looked from the outset like a "no win" situation-not a happy crisis at the start of an election year. Even so, he had framed the outline of his plan by the time his cabinet members gathered at eight o'clock the next morning.

**There were no blacks in his cabinet**. Four years before, during his first election campaign, **the President had made some vague promises of diversity when speaking to minority gatherings**. **But after the election, he thought, what the hell!** Most blacks and Hispanics had not supported him or his party. Although he had followed the practice of keeping one black on the Supreme Court, it had not won him many minority votes. **He owed them nothing.** Furthermore, the few black figures in the party always seemed to him overly opportunistic and, to be frank, not very smart. But now, as the cabinet members arrived, he wished he had covered his bases better.

**The President had asked Gleason Golightly, the conservative black economics professor, who was his unofficial black cabinet member, to attend the meeting.** Golightly was smart and seemed to be truly conservative, not a man ready to sing any political tune for a price. **His mere presence as a person of color at this crucial session would neutralize any possible critics in the media**, though not in the black civil rights community.

The cabinet meeting came to order. **“I think we all know the situation,” the President said. “Those extraterrestrial beings** are carrying in their ships a **guarantee that America will** conquer its present problems and **prosper for at least all of this new century.” “I would venture, sir,” the Vice President noted, “that** the balance **of your [the president’s] term will be known as ‘America’s Golden Age.’** Indeed, the era will almost certainly extend to the terms of your successor.” The President smiled at the remark, as-on cue-did the cabinet. “The VP is right, of course,” the President said. “Our visitors from outer space are offering us the chance to correct the excesses of several generations. Furthermore, **many of the men and women-voters all-who are bombarding us with phone calls, see an added bonus in the Space Traders’ offer.”** He looked around at his attentive cabinet members. **“They are offering not only a solution to our nation’s present problems but also one-surely an ultimate one-to what might be called the great American racial experiment.** That’s the real issue before us today. Does the promise of restored prosperity justify our sending away fifteen percent of our citizens to Lord knows what fate?”

“There are pluses and minuses to this ‘fate’ issue, Mr. President.” Helen Hipmeyer, Secretary of Health and Human Services, usually remained silent at cabinet meetings. Her speaking up now caused eyebrows to rise around the table. **“A large percentage of blacks rely on** welfare and other **social services. Their departure would ease** substantially **the burden on our state** and national budgets.Why, **the cost of caring for black AIDS victims alone has been extraordinary. On the other hand, the** consternation and **guilt among many whites if the blacks are sent away would take a severe psychological toll, with medical and other costs which might also reach astronomical levels.** To gain the benefits we are discussing, without serious side effects, we must have more justification than I’ve heard thus far.”

His suggestion kindled a thought in **the Secretary of Defense [said]**. **“Mr. President, the Secretary’s courage is not unlike that American men and women have exhibited when called to military service.** Some go more willingly than others, but almost all go even with the knowledge that they may not come back. **It is a call a country makes on the assumption that its citizens will respond. I think that is the situation we have here, except that instead of just young men and women, the country needs all of its citizens of African descent to step forward and serve.”** More applause greeted this suggestion. The Attorney General asked for and got the floor. “Mr. President, I think we could put together a legislative.

**“What are your thoughts on all this, Professor Golightly?” asked the President**, nodding at the scholarly-looking black man sitting far down the table. The President realized that there would be a lot more opposition to a selective service plan among ordinary citizens than among the members of his cabinet, and hoped Golightly would have some ideas for getting around it. Golightly began as though he understood the kind of answer the President wanted. 4 “**As you know, Mr. President, I have supported this administration’s policies that have led to the repeal[ed] of some civil rights laws, to invalidation of most affirmative action programs, and to severe reduction in appropriations for public assistance.** To put it mildly, the positions of mine that have received a great deal of media attention, have not been well received in African-American communities. Even so**, I have been willing to be a ‘good soldier’ for the Party** even though I am condemned as an Uncle Tom by my people. **I sincerely believe that black people needed to stand up on their own feet**, free of special protection provided by civil rights laws, the suffocating burden of welfare checks, and the stigmatizing influence of affirmative action programs. **In helping you undermine these policies, I realized that your reasons for doing so differed from mine. And yet I went along**.” Golightly stopped. He reached down for his coffee mug, took a few sips, and ran his fingers through his graying but relatively straight (what some black people call “good”) hair. “Mr. President, my record of support entitles me to be heard on the Space Traders’ proposition. **I disagree strongly with both the Secretary of the Interior and the Attorney General. What they are proposing is not universal selective service for blacks. It is group banishment**, a most severe penalty and one that the Attorney General would impose without benefit of either due process or judicial review.

**“Mr. President,”** he continued, **“you and your cabinet must place this offer in historical perspective.** **This is far from the first time this country’s leaders have considered and rejected the removal of all those here of African descent.** Benjamin Franklin and other abolitionists actively sought schemes to free the slaves and return them to their homeland. Lincoln examined and supported emigration programs both before and after he freed the slaves. Even those Radical Republicans who drafted the Civil War amendments wondered whether Africans could ever become a part of the national scene, a part of the American people.

Returning to his place, Golightly continued. “This status has provided this nation an essential stability, one you sacrifice at your peril. With all due respect, Mr. President**, acceptance of the Space Traders’ solution will not bring a century of prosperity to this country**. Secretary Hipmeyer is correct**. What today seems to you a solution** from Heaven **will instead herald a decade of shame and dissension** mirroring the moral conflicts that precipitated this nation into its most bloody conflict, the Civil War. The deep, self-indicted wounds of that era have never really healed. Their reopening will inevitably lead to confrontations and strife that could cause the eventual dissolution of the nation.”

Now, as he sat alone, **he feared that this morning’s meeting was that big chance, and he had failed it.** The stakes, of course, were larger than he would have ever imagined they might be, and **yet he thought he’d had the arguments**. **In retrospect, though, those [his] arguments were based on morality and assumed a willingness on the part of the President and the cabinet to be fair, or at least to balance the benefits** of the Trade **against the sacrifice** it would require of a selected portion of the American people. Instead of outsmarting them, **Golightly had done what he so frequently criticized civil rights spokespersons for doing: he had tried to get whites to do right by black people because it was right that they do so.** “Crazy!” he commented when civil rights people did it. “Crazy!” he mumbled to himself, at himself.

At that moment, Professor Gleason Golightly sought the floor propose an alternative response to the Trade offer. **Golighty’s close connection to the conservative administration and active support of its anti-black views made him far from a hero to most blacks**. Many viewed his appearance at this critical hour as an administration sponsored effort to undermine the coalition’s defensive plans and tactics. At last, though, **he prevailed on the conference leaders to grant[ed] him five minutes**. As he moved toward the podium, there was a wave of hostile murmuring whose justification Golightly acknowledged: **“I am well aware that political and ideological differences have for several years sustained a wide chasm between us. But the events of two days ago have transformed our disputes into a painful reminder of our shared status.** I am here because, whatever our ideological differences or our socioeconomic positions, we all know that black rights, black interests, black property, even black lives are expendable whenever their sacrifice will further or sustain white needs or preferences.” Hearing Golightly admitting to truths he had long denied, served to silence the murmuring. “**It has become an unwritten tradition in this country for whites to sacrifice our rights to further their own interests. This tradition overshadows the national debate about the Space Traders’ offer and may well foretell our reply to it.”** Oblivious of the whites in the audience, Golightly said, “I realize that our liberal white friends continue to reassure us. ‘This is America,’ they tell us. ‘It can’t happen here.’ But I’ve noticed that those whites who are most vigorous in their assurances are least able to rebut the contrary teaching of both historic fact and present reality. **Outside civil rights gatherings like this, the masses of black people-those you claim to represent but to whom you seldom listen-are mostly resigned to the nation’s acceptance of the Space Traders’ offer. For them, liberal optimism is smothered by their life experience.**

“Black people know for a fact what you, their leaders, fear to face. **Black people know your plans for legislation, litigation, and protest cannot prevail against the tradition of sacrificing black rights. Indeed, your efforts will simply add a veneer of face-saving uncertainty to a debate whose outcome** **is** not only predictable, but **inevitable. Flying in the face of our history, you are still relying on the assumption that whites really want to grant justice to blacks, really want to alleviate onerous racial conditions.**” “Professor Golightly,” the chairman interrupted, “the time we have allotted you has almost expired. The delegates here are weary and anxious to return to their homes so that they can assist their families through this crisis. The defense plans we have formulated are our best effort. Sir, if you have a better way, let us hear it now.”

Seemingly unmoved by the outburst, Golightly waited until the audience quieted, then continued. “A major, perhaps the principal, motivation for racism in this country is the deeply held belief that black people should not have anything that white people don’t have. Not only do whites insist on better jobs, higher incomes, better schools and neighborhoods, better everything, but they also usurp aspects of our culture. They have ‘taken our blues and gone,’ to quote Langston Hughessongs that sprang from our very subordination. Whites exploit not only our music but our dance, language patterns, dress and hair styles as well. Even the badge of our inferior status, our color, is not sacrosanct, whites spending billions a year to emulate our skin tones, paradoxically, as a sign of their higher status. So whites’ appropriation of what is ours and their general acquisitiveness are facts-facts we must make work for us. Rather than resisting the Space Traders’ offer, **let us circulate widely the rumor that the Space Traders, aware of our long fruitless struggle on this planet, are arranging to transport us to a land of milk and honey-a virtual paradise**. **”Remember, most whites are so jealous of their race-based prerogatives that they oppose affirmative action even though many of these programs would remove barriers that exclude whites as well as blacks.** **Can we not [can] expect such whites-notwithstanding even the impressive benefits offered by the space Traders-to go all out to prevent blacks from gaining access to an extraterrestrial New Jerusalem?** Although you are planning to litigate against the Trade on the grounds that it is illegal discrimination to limit it to black people, mark my words, **our ‘milk and honey’ story will inspire whites to institute such litigation on the grounds that limiting the space Traders’ offer to black people is unconstitutional discrimination against whites!** “Many of you have charged that I have become expert at manipulating white people for personal gain. Although profit has not in fact motivated my actions, I certainly have learned to understand how whites think on racial issues. On that knowledge, I am willing to wage my survival and that of my family. I urge you to do the same. This strategy is, however, risky, our only hope.” The murmurs had subsided into stony silence by the time Golightly left the podium. ”Does anyone care to respond to Professor Golightly’s suggestion?” the chairman finally asked. Justin Jasper, a well-known and highly respected Baptist minister, came to the microphone. “I readily concede Dr. Golightly’s expertise in the psychology of whites’ thinking. Furthermore, as he requests, I hold in abeyance my deep distrust of a black man whose willing service to whites has led him to become a master minstrel of political mimicry. But my problem with his plan is twofold. First it rings hollow because it so resembles Dr. Golightly’s consistent opposition in the past to all our civil rights initiatives. Once again, he is urging us to accept rather than oppose a racist policy. And, not only are we not to resist, but we are to beg the country to lead us to the sacrificial altar. God may have that power, but Dr. Golightly is not my god!”

**Though seldom acknowledging the fact, most business leaders understood that blacks were crucial in stabilizing the economy** with its ever-increasing disparity between the incomes of rich and poor. **They recognized that potentially turbulent unrest among those on the bottom was deflected by the continuing efforts of poorer whites to ensure that they**, at least, **remained ahead of blacks**. If blacks were removed from the society, **working- and middle-class whites-deprived of their racial distraction-might look upward toward the top of the societal well and realize that they as well as the blacks below them suffered because of the gross disparities in opportunities and income.** Many of these corporate leaders and their elected representatives had for many years exploited poor whites’ ignorance of their real enemy. Now, what had been a comforting insulation of their privileges and wealth, posed a serious barrier to what a majority saw as a first priority: to persuade the country to reject the Trade. A quick survey of the media and advertising representatives present was not encouraging. “It would be quite a challenge,” one network executive said, “but we simply can’t change this country’s view about the superiority of whites and the inferiority of blacks in a week. I doubt you could do it in a decade.”

7 January. **Groups supporting the Space Traders’ proposition had from the beginning taken seriously blacks’ charges that acceptance of it would violate the Constitution**’s most basic protections. Acting swiftly, and with the full cooperation of the states, **they had set in motion the steps necessary to convene[d] a constitutional convention** in Philadelphia. (“Of course!” groaned Golightly when he heard of it.) And there, on this day, **on the site of the original constitutional convention, delegates**-chosen, in accordance with Article V of the Constitution, by the state legislatures-quickly drafted, and by a substantial majority **passed, the Twenty-seventh Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. It declared: Without regard to the language or interpretations previously given any other provision of this document, every U**nited **S**tates **citizen is subject at the call of Congress to selection for special service for periods necessary to protect domestic interests and international needs.** The amendment was scheduled for ratification by the states on 15 January in a national referendum. **If ratified, the amendment would validate amendments to existing Selective Service laws authoriz[e] the induction of all blacks into special service for transportation under the terms of the Space Traders’ offer.**

10 January. **In the brief but intense pre-election day campaign, the pro-ratification groups’ major argument had an appeal that surprised even those who made it.** Their message was straightforward. **The Framers intended America to be a white country. The evidence of their intentions is present in the original Constitution.** After more than a hundred and thirty-seven years of good-faith efforts to build a healthy, stable interracial nation, **we have concluded-as the Framers did** in the beginning-that our survival today requires **that we sacrifice the rights of blacks in order to protect and further the interests of whites**. The Framers’ example must be our guide. Patriotism, and not pity, must govern our decision**. We should ratify the amendment and accept the Space Traders’ proposition.**

**As for the argument that the sacrifice of black rights in political compromises was odious racial discrimination, pro-Trade forces contended that “fortuitous fate and not blatant racism” should be held responsible.** Just as men and not women are inducted into the military, and even then only men of a certain age and physical and mental condition, so only some groups are destined by their role in the nation’s history to serve as catalyst for stability and progress. “All Americans are expected to make sacrifices for the good of their country. Black people are no exceptions to this basic obligation of citizenship. Their role may be special, but so is that of many of those who serve**. The role that blacks may be called on to play in response to the Space Traders’ offer is, however regrettable, neither immoral nor unconstitutional.**” A tremendous groundswell of public agreement with the pro-Trade position drowned out anti-Trade complaints of unfairness. Powerful as would have been the notion of seeing the Space Traders’ offer as no more than a fortuitous circumstance, in which blacks might be called on to sacrifice for their country, the “racial sacrifice as historic necessity” argument made the pro-Trade position irresistible to millions of voters-and to their Congressional representatives.

14 January. With the legal questions of the Trade resolved, the U.S. government announced that as a result of intensive negotiations with the Space Trader leaders, the latter had agreed to amend their offer and exclude from the Trade all black people seventy years old, and older, and all those blacks who were seriously handicapped, ill, and injured. In addition, a thousand otherwise-eligible blacks and their immediate families would be left behind as trustees of black property and possessions, all of which were to be stored or held in escrow in case blacks were returned to this country. Each of the thousand black “detainees” was required to pledge to accept a subordinate status with “suspended citizenship” until such time as the “special service inductees” were returned to the country. The administration selected blacks to remain who had records of loyalty to the conservative party and no recorded instances of militant activity. Even so, many of those blacks selected declined to remain. “We will, like the others,” said one black who rejected detainee status, “take our chances with the referendum.” 13 15 January. Many whites had, to their credit, been working day and night to defeat the amendment; but, as is the usual fate of minority rights when subjected to referenda or initiatives, the outcome was never really in doubt. The final vote tally confirmed the predictions. **By 70 percent to 30 percent, American citizens voted to ratif[ied] the constitutional amendment that provided a legal basis** \*Justice Holmes wrote: “Unless we are prepared to supervise the voting in that state by officers of the court, it seems to us that all the plaintiff could get from equity would be an empty form. Apart from damages to the individual, relief from a great political wrong, if done, as alleged by the people of a state and the state itself, must be given to them or by the legislature and political department of the Government of the United States for acceptance of the Space Traders’ offer. In anticipation of this result, government agencies had secretly made preparations to facilitate the transfer. Some blacks escaped, and many thousands lost their lives in futile efforts to resist the joint federal and state police teams responsible for rounding up, cataloguing, and transporting blacks to the coast. 16 January. Professor Golightly and his family were not granted detainee status. Instead, the White House promised him safe passage to Canada for all his past services even though he had not made the patriotic appeal the President had requested of him. But, at the border that evening, he was stopped and turned back. It turned out the Secretary of the Interior had called to countermand his departure. Golightly was not surprised. What really distressed him was his failure to convince the black leaders of the anti-Trade coalition to heed their own rhetoric: namely that whites in power would, given the chance, do to privileged blacks what, in fact, they had done to all blacks. ”I wonder,” he murmured, half to himself, half to his wife, as they rode in a luxury limousine sent, in some irony, by the Secretary of the Interior to convey them to the nearest round up point, “how my high-minded brothers at the conference feel now about their decision to fail with integrity rather than stoop to the bit of trickery that might have saved them.” **“But, Gleason,” his wife asked, “would our lives have really been better had we fooled the country into voting against the Trade? If the Space Traders were to depart, carrying away with them what they and everyone else says can solve our major domestic problems, wouldn’t people increasingly blame us blacks for increases in debt, pollution, and fuel shortages?** We might have saved ourselves-but only to face here a fate as dire as any we face in space.” ”I hope your stoic outlook helps us through whatever lies ahead,” Golightly responded as the car stopped. Then guards hustled him and his family toward the buses being loaded with other blacks captured at the Canadian border. 17 January. The last Martin Luther King holiday the nation would ever observe dawned on an extraordinary sight. **In the night, the Space Traders had drawn their strange ships right up to the beaches and discharged their cargoes of gold, minerals, and machinery, leaving vast empty holds. Crowded on the beaches were inductees, some twenty million silent black men, women, and children, including babes in arms.** As the sun rose, the Space Traders directed them, first, to strip off all but a single undergarment; then, to line up; and finally, to enter those holds which yawned in the morning light like Milton’s “darkness visible.” The inductees looked fearfully behind them. But, on the dunes above the beaches, guns at the ready, stood U.S. guards. There was no escape, no alternative. Heads bowed, arms now linked by slender chains, **black people left the New World as their forebears had arrived.**

**The impact is that accepting the proposal of the Space Traders is the worst form of anti-black violence because whites are selling black americans off to be reenslaved by aliens. They are literally being forced from their homes and treated as disposable bodies by being traded away. To combat this anti-black proposal, we must refuse to produce nuclear power which entails refusing to betray black americans.**

## PART 3 IS FRAMING

#### The ROB is to vote for the debater who best performatively and methodologically challenges Anti-Blackness. The Ontological starting point of the AFF is necessary for any other talk about oppression since any ROB presupposes some conception of being. Pedagogy is a question of racism or anti-racism; advocacy is never neutral. And all Fiat is illusory—when you sign the ballot neither the alternative or affirmative occur in the real world, so there is nothing more illusory about fiating in a science fiction world than another other conception of fiat; The debate space has failed in breaking down the structures of race by excluding discussion-now is the time for change to occur. Brinkley

**Brinkley ’12 (Dr. Shanara Reed-Brinkley, An Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication at the University of Pittsburgh, where she also serves as the Director of Debate for the William Pitt Debating Union. She is a national award winner for her published work on critical theory, black feminist theory, gender, black culture and history, and hip hop culture and theory, Resistance and Debate, “**[An Open Letter to Sarah Spring](http://resistanceanddebate.wordpress.com/2012/11/12/an-open-letter-to-sarah-spring/)” http://resistanceanddebate.wordpress.com/2012/11/12/an-open-letter-to-sarah-spring/)

Lack of community discussion is neither random nor power-neutral. We have tried to have discussions.  These discussions have been regularly derailed—in “wrong forum” arguments, in the demand for “evidence,” in the unfair burdens placed on the aggrieved as a pre-requisite for engagement.  Read the last ten years of these discussions on edebate archives: Ede Warner on edebate and move forward to Rashad Evans diversity discussion from 2010 to Deven Cooper to Amber Kelsie’s discussion on CEDA Forums and the NDT CEDA Traditions page. We have been talking for over a decade, we have been reaching out for years, we have been listening to the liberal, moderate refrain of “we agree with your goals but not with your method.” We will no longer wait for the community to respond, to relinquish privilege, to engage in authentic discussion, since largely the community seems incapable of producing a consensus for responding to what “we all agree” is blatant structural inequity. It seems that meta-debates/discussions about debate are generally met with denial, hostility and—more often—silence.  This silence is in fact a focused silence.  It is not people in the Resistance Facebook group that comprise these silent figures—it is (as has been described) “the old boys club.”  We have been quite vocal—and we believe that it is this very vocalness (and the development of a diversity of tactics in response to status quo stalling tactics) that has provoked response when response was given.  Sarah Spring’s cedadebate post is a case in point.  The decision to change our speaker point scale is not in order to produce a “judging doomsday apparatus” (this kind of apocalyptic rhetoric might more aptly be applied to the current racist/sexist/classist state of affairs in this community), though we must admit that we are flattered that our efforts have affected the community enough to result in such a hyberbolic labeling.  It indicates that civil disobedience is still an effective tactic; the debate community should take it as an indication that our calls for change are serious.  We will continue to innovate and collaborate on tactics of resistance. This “crisis” in debate has no end in sight. The rationale for changing the point scale was not simply to “reward” people for preferring the unpreferred critic.  We recognize that MPJ produces effects, and we hoped that changing our point scale was a small but significant tactic that was available to the disenfranchised in this community.  MPJ: A)   Limits judging opportunities for blacks, browns, and womyn B)   Limits opportunities for debaters who are (and are not) black, brown, and womyn to be judged by such critics. The effect is:  A)   That the evaluations of these categorically marginalized critics are deemed not valuable or costly. B)   That the debate efforts of categorically marginalized debaters are deemed not valuable. We believe that debaters deserve to have black, brown, and womyn critics (in general debaters should be judged by multiply situated critics across varying social locations). We think the community deserves to know what we have to say.  Therefore, it seemed appropriate in this context to play the discriminative logics at work against themselves by demonstrating just what “value” or “cost” our evaluations could have.  We worked with the limited options available to us. It seems this system works as long as it is comfortable for the majority or the major powerbrokers.  The community pays lip service to, or simply ignores, the concerns of those for whom this system is not working.  Now it is everyone’s concern. To be clear: we did not alter our point scale because we believe we are not preferred for unjust reasons (we know we are not preferred for unjust reasons), but because the system produces the effect of magnifying and enforcing on a social scale the delegitimation of blacks, browns, and womyn.  We think this is a question of ethics and a question of pedagogy; it is something that stunts the growth of all members of this community regardless of identity or social positioning.

## Part 4 is the Method

#### Science fiction completely inverts preconceived notions of black identity by radically re-imagining new possibilities of black empowerment. Womack

Womack, Ytasha. Afrofuturism: the world of Black sci-fi and fantasy culture. Chicago Review Press, 2013.

This blossoming culture is unique. Unlike previous eras, today’s artists can wield the power of digital media, social platforms, digital video, graphic arts, gaming technology, and more to tell their stories, share their stories, and connect with audiences inexpensively—a gift from the sci-fi gods, so to speak, that was unthinkable at the turn of the century. The storytelling gatekeepers vanished with the high-speed modem, and for the first time in history, people of color have a greater ability to project their own stories. This tug-and-pull debate over black people controlling their image shifts considerably when a fledgling filmmaker can shoot his sci-fi web series on a $500 DV cam, post it on YouTube, and promote it on Instagram and Twitter. While technology empowers creators, this intrigue with scifi and fantasy itself inverts conventional thinking about black identity and holds the imagination supreme. Black identity does not have to be a negotiation with awful stereotypes, a dystopian view of the race (remember those black-man-as-endangeredspecies stories or the constant “Why are black women single?” reports?), an abysmal sense of powerlessness, or a reckoning of hardened realities. Fatalism is not a synonym for blackness. If a story line or an artist’s disposition wasn’t washed in fatalism, southern edicts, or urbanized reality, then some questioned whether it was even “black.” Sci-fi vanguard and writer Octavia Butler, who authored the famous Parable series and laid the groundwork for countless sci-fi heroines and writers to follow, said it never failed that she’d be confronted by someone at a conference who would ask, “Just what does science fiction have to do with black people?”

This open play with the imagination, one that isn’t limited to Halloween or film, is a break from identity, one that mirrors the dress-up antics associated with George Clinton, Grace Jones, and other eccentric luminaries now dubbed Afrofuturists. While it’s all play, there’s a power in breaking past rigid identity parameters and adopting the persona of one’s favorite hero. “Cosplay is a form of empowerment for all children and adults,” says Stanford Carpenter, president and cofounder of the Institute for Comics Studies, who says that he used to be dismissive of cosplay. But after attending dozens of ComicCons, he witnessed the dress-up affair changing masked heroes indefinitely. “It’s about empowerment. It’s about the possibility of what you can be or what you can do. And when you see people in underrepresented groups, it takes on the empowerment fantasy of not just, say, being Superman, but also the dimension of stepping on the much more narrow roles that we are assigned. But this idea of this superhero has an added dimension because it inherently pushes against many of the stereotypes that are thrust upon us. It is this opportunity to push the boundaries of what you can be and in so doing, you’re imagining a whole new world and possibilities for yourself that can extend beyond the cosplay experience,” says Carpenter. “It’s like stepping to the top of the mountaintop where everything looks small. It’s not that you stay on the mountain top forever, but when you come down you’re not the same. You have a new perspective. A choice that you don’t know is a choice that you don’t have. The imagination is the greatest resource that humans have. Cosplay builds on that. Cosplay puts imagination and desire into action in a way that allows people to look at things differently.”

#### Racial Realism is key. Society will never rid itself of oppression, but survival politics is what’s important. Bell

Bell, Derrick. "Racial realism." Conn. L. Rev. 24 (1991): 363.

While implementing Racial Realism we must simultaneously acknowledge that our actions are not likely to lead to transcend change and, despite our best efforts, may be of more help to the system we despite than to the victims of that system we are trying to help. Nevertheless, our realization, and the dedication based on that realization, can lead to policy positions and campaigns that are less likely to worsen conditions for those we are trying to help, and will be more likely to remind those in power that there are imaginative, unabashed risk-takers who refuse to the trammeled upon. Yet confrontation with our oppressors is not our sole reason for engaging in Racial Realism. Continued struggle can bring about unexpected benefits and gains that in themselves justify continued endeavor. The fight in itself has meaning and should give us hope for the future.

Attempt to combine performative elements and post-fiat advocacy opens me to some theoretical objection which creates a bad tradeoff for the thing we need to accomplish first. It’s not just that the AFF is a pre-requisite, but part of engaging is the recognition that we need to divest ourselves from the trap that the politics of hope would potentially have. I’m a student in the debate space… the demand that you do the AFF + some post-fiat advocacy assumes that in the context of the space—assumes that I can sufficiently inspire creative re-imaginings that in the context of the round such that I could make sense of what a policy ought to be

You can’t hold us to doing both because that makes us create an extra-topical advocacy because we have to do the AFF advocacy + implementing a policy. This is a sequency issue—we can’t do both because we would lose every round.

#### Space Traders’ historicity uncovers uneasy intuitions, ridding complacency. Delgado

Delgado, Richard, and Jean Stefancic. "Derrick Bell's Chronicle of the Space Traders: Would the US Sacrifice People of Color if the Price Were Right." U. Colo. L. Rev. 62 (1991): 321.

Bell's scathing skepticism thus finds ample support in our history. Indeed, the space trade might in one respect be even easier to carry out than African slavery or Indian relocation. Throughout our past, acts of mass cruelty have been preceded by a barrage of publicity aimed at convincing ourselves that our cause was just.26 With the communication and media technology available today, disseminating the necessary stories and myths might be even easier than before. Bell may well be right, then, that Americans would quickly and with few qualms endorse the space trade. Yet, by emphasizing slightly different elements in our culture and consciousness, a different account can be made to emerge.

Hardly anyone who reads the Chronicle remains unmoved. Many whites are offended at Bell's suggestion that we have made no racial progress-that we would sacrifice Blacks today, just as we did in former times, out of self-interest and avarice. This time, they say, Bell has gone too far. People of color, by contrast, tend to find the Chronicle quite believable.4 It captures an uneasy intuition that we live at the sufferance of whites--that as soon as our welfare conflicts with something they consider essential, all our gains, all our progress, will turn out to be illusory. Bell's Chronicle is a classic Jeremiad-a tale aim[s] at making a powerful group aware of its own iniquitous history and potential for more of the same. It aims at kindling conscience and jarring complacency. It performs this function ably: its pessimistic message rings true. Yet, people cannot live without hope, without signposts, without some indication that the future will not be a continuation of the present. 48 Storytelling is essential for social movement, precisely because it insists that our choice of narrative matters.49 It matters precisely because we are learning that the quest for a universal theory of law or culture is fruitless but nevertheless continues. There is no one single Good, no single best law, no single best way of governing ourselves.50 There are only multiple perspectives; nothing is static, our ideas are constantly evolving, we redefine ourselves without end. Microcosmic goods-acts of kindness and compassion- may ultimately be all that we can have and know.5 If the law aims for these, it may accomplish more than it has in the pastwhen it ignored particularity, overlooking concrete, demonstrable evil in the vain hope of finding a universal Good. 48.

#### Bell’s racial realism is very real-world. Curry

Dr. Tommy J. Curry, “We Who Must Fight in the Shade: Derrick Bell’s Philosophy of Racial Realism as the basis of a Black Politics of Disempowerment.”

This paper intends to convey four theoretical contributions to our current understandings of racism in the post-civil rights era. First, **I want to question** the mainstay tradition of Black social/political philosophy and **race theory that continues to celebrate liberalism as a vehicle for racial progress.** **Following** the work of Derrick **Bell, I maintain that this is in a very real sense an unjustifiable romanticization of the Civil Rights Era**, specifically the effect of Brown v. Board on American race relations. Second, I want to clarify Derrick’s position on liberalism and a means through which Black political theorists can distance themselves from this dogma of integrationism which I term “conceptual disengagement.” Third, I argue that this disengagement would allow Black scholars to better understand the relationship that W.E.B. DuBois points out to Black Americans in accepting minuscule political privileges when the consequence of such luxuries is the furthering of American imperialism and the capitalist exploitation of the darker races the world over. Lastly, I am interested in presenting a contrasting political theory rooted in the disempowerment of white supremacist institutions and structures of American society. **In stark contrast to** the **ideal theories** of integration and ethical theories that ask the oppressed to assume, despite historical reason or contemporary consciousness, that their racial oppressors will freely surrender their power and position, **disempowerment divests the normative expectations and ameliorative possibilities of a political system that** has preserved, perpetuated, **and propagates white supremacy. Bell’s racial realism demystifies the illusion and rhetorical stratagem of the Civil Rights era moralism.** As a political theory, **disempowerment**, building on the realism conveyed by DuBois and elaborated upon by Bell, **indicts** the **political structures**, the courts, the political economics, and the public consciousness that sustains white dominance despite the alleged opening up of American society through desegregation. How can Black scholars, race theorists, and social justice theorists continue to demand allegiance to the structures that have continued to subjugate, when it is the political repression—the erasure of the racial and economic inequality that has resulted from America’s civil rights epoch—that continues present itself as an obstacle to the awareness of America’s racist social stratifications. Is this the task of Black political theory, to criticize only in vain hope of inclusion? Is it the task of the Black political theorist to reinvent and give their oppressors a language, a lexicon, to describe subjugated racial peoples deemed irrelevant? Or is it the task of the Black political theorist to use those deaths, the murders of young Black boys, like Travyon Martin, as the catalyst for conversations with whites who ignore, rationalize, or eulogize this injustice? **Racial realism and its outgrowth of disempowerment is not a radical theorization of political advocacy, rather it is simply the articulation of Black experiences that have sought to “take away” from their oppressors the means and subservience that denies and leaves unchallenged the actual (real) instruments of racist oppression.**

#### Passing off subjective conceptions of fairness as objective both justifies and has empirically caused exclusion within the debate space as majority white male conceptions of debate become norms creating entrance barriers. WARNER

Ede Warner Jr. is a Professor of Communications and debate coach at the University of Louisiana, "Go Homers, Makeovers or Takeovers? A Privilege Analysis of Debate as a Gaming Simulation.” 2013.

More often than not, talk about privilege in debate is relegated mostly to economic and occasionally gender- or race-based discussions. Refocused recruiting efforts and accomplishments like Urban Debate Leagues and Women’s Caucuses at tournaments are addressing more overt concerns in an effort to create more equal playing fields, yet tremendous inequities remain that require explanation. **Over twenty years of various diversity efforts**, especially in CEDA, **have failed** to substantially change the racial, gender, social and economic composition of interscholastic Spolicy debate at its highest levels. **The reason is simple:** privilege extends much further than just acknowledging overt and obvious disparities. Privilege creeps into more subtle, covert spaces, like the essence of why and how people “play the game,”recognizing that the **rules and procedures are created by those carrying** that **privilege.** Snider argues that the greatness of debate as a game is in his belief that it is short on inflexible rules and long on debatable procedures. However, if procedures are *functionally* not debatable and begin to look more like participation requirements than starting points of discussion, the quality of the game, is “not as successful and well-designed” (Snider, 1987, p. 123). Privilege envelopes both substantive and stylistic procedures, increasing the likelihood that supposedly debatable conventions become rigid norms, preventing achievement of a “more thoughtful” game and **creat**ing **entrance barriers**to successful participation. Here’s how. Snider (1987) says that evaluation of a “**winning” procedural[s]** argument **occur**s **through the lenses of** determining which procedures best facilitate **achieving** the **goals of** the **debate** activity**.** Snider offers three such goals: 1) education of the participants; 2) discussion of important issues in the resolution; and 3) creation of a fair contest. He concedes that some may be missing. Of course,interested **participants with lesser privilege might select different goals as more important**, such as having a voice to discuss the topic through the perspective of their social concerns, **even if this perspective doesn’t fit** nicely **with** some of the **other goals. More often than not, the creation of a “fair contest” is given an absolute priority** relative to other goals and justifies **ignoring** attempts to achieve **other** game **objectives.** At least one implicit goal deserves mention: incorporation of the cultural and social values of the participants. It makes sense that the **like-minded values of the largest participating class will dominant** procedural and **rule development** of a game simulation. Cultural and social values may appear to have little or no relationship to the first three goals of debate. But in fact, the **cultural and social values will in many ways dictate the meaning of** Snider’s goals. What types of education do the participants’ value? Who decides what the important issues are—the participants? The communities most directly related to the topic? Do cultural and social values privilege any notions of “fairness”? Cultural and social background surely impacts each of these areas tremendously. If there are cultural or social disagreements over **what constitutes “education,”** what “issues” are important, **or what is “fair,”** then privilege plays a much larger role in game development than has been acknowledged to date.

1. **It’s both impossible and exclusive to enforce fairness claims since there’s no static, objective concept that can be agreed to since it applies differently to different people. Every institution dispenses some form of knowledge which means every concept of “fairness” is necessarily produced by the structures that surround us. Injecting non-Eurocentric forms of knowledge is key to forming true norms.**
2. **The idea of “perfect engagement” is ridiculous. Just because certain ways of constructing my AFF would improve quality of engagement doesn’t mean that amount of quality is necessary before we can have a productive discussion. That’s Reid-Brinkley.**

#### Only be recognizing privilege can white people reach the brink of subjectivity. Wilderson

#### Wilderson 8 (Frank, “Biko and the Problematic of Presence,” in Biko Lives!: Contesting the Legacies of Steve Biko, p. 102)

**Even if** these **White radicals had been persuaded** by Biko and Black Consciousness **that the** essential **nature of the antagonism was** not capitalism but **anti-Blackness** (and no doubt some had been persuaded), **they could not have been persuaded to organize in a** **politically masochistic manner**; that is, against the concreteness of their own communities, their own families, and themselves, rather than against the abstraction of “the system”—the targetless nomenclature preferred by the UDF. **Political masochism would indeed be ethical but would also bring them to the brink of the abyss of their own subjectivity**. They would be embarking upon a political journey the trajectory of which would not simply hold out the promise of obliterating class relations and establishing an egalitarian socius (what less articulate and more starry-eyed White activists in the United States refer to as “vision”), but they would be embarking upon a journey whose trajectory Frantz Fanon called “the end of the world.”22 The “new” world that class-based political “vision” is predicated on (i.e., the dictatorship of the proletariat) isn’t new in the sense that it ushers in an unimaginable episteme; it is really no more than a reorganization of Modernity’s own instruments of knowledge. But a world without race, more precisely, a world without Blackness, is truly unimaginable. Such a world cannot be accomplished with a blueprint of what is to come on the other side. It must be undone because, as Biko, Fanon, and others have intimated, it is unethical, but it cannot be refashioned in the mind prior to its undoing. **A political project such as this**, **whereby the only certainty is uncertainty and a loss of all of one’s coordinates**, **is not the kind of political project Whites could be expected to meditate on**, agitate for, theorize, or finance. And though it might not be the kind of project that Blacks would consciously support, it is the essence of the psychic and material location of where Blacks are. Caught between a shameful return to liberalism and a terrifying encounter with the abyss of Black “life”— caught, that is, between liberalism and death—some White activists took up the banner of socialism, others espoused a vague but vociferous anti-apartheidism, and most simply worked aimlessly yet tirelessly to fortify and extend the interlocutory life of “the ANC’s long-standing policy of deferring consideration of working class interests . . . until after national liberation had been achieved.”23

Acknowledging why I’m in a dominant position is important because otherwise it would be impossible to break down systems that prohibit those people from attaining subjectivity.

# Frontlines

### A2 – Topicality [1:20]

#### We are a topical discussion—we criticize the way the USFG trades Black people for Nuclear Power—that’s our Dixon and Amuwo evidence. The State pillages Black communities while appealing to concepts like ‘equity’ and ‘utility’ to justify covert forms of racism, while not looking into the unique effects on these disadvantaged individuals.

#### Cross-Apply the Reid-Brinkley EV from the 1AC: Pedagogically T/Theory detract the debate from the voices of the minority and reinforce the voice of major powerbrokers.

#### Communal norms institute racist practices and make disadvantaged voices unheard. Academic debate must change now. Smith

Smith, Elijah, “A Conversation in Ruins: Race and Black Participation in Lincoln Douglas Debate.” 2013.

It will be uncomfortable, it will be hard, and it will require continued effort but the necessary step in fixing this problem, like all problems, is the community as a whole admitting that such a problem with many “socially acceptable” choices exists in the first place. **Like all systems of social control, the reality of racism in debate is constituted by the singular choices that institutions, coaches, and students make[.]** on a weekly basis. I have watched countless rounds where competitors attempt to win by rushing to abstractions to distance the conversation from the material reality that black debaters are forced to deal with every day. One of the students I coached, who has since graduated after leaving debate, had an adult judge write out a ballot that concluded by “hypothetically” defending my student being *lynched* at the tournament. Another debate concluded with a young man defending that we can kill animals humanely, “just like we did that guy Troy Davis”. **Community norms would have competitors do intellectual gymnastics or make up rules to accuse black debaters of breaking to escape hard conversations but** as someone who understands that experience, **the only constructive strategy is to acknowledge the reality of the oppressed, engage** the discussion from the perspective of authors who are black and brown, **and** then **find strategies to deal with the issues** at hand. It hurts to see competitive seasons come and go and have high school students and judges spew the same hateful things you expect to hear at a Klan rally. A student should not, when presenting an advocacy that aligns them with the oppressed, have to justify why oppression is bad. **Debate is not just a game, but a learning environment with liberatory potential.** Even if the form debate gives to a conversation is not the same you would use to discuss race in general conversation with Bayard Rustin or Fannie Lou Hamer, that is not a reason we have to strip that conversation of its connection to a reality that black students cannot escape.

#### Passing off subjective conceptions of fairness as objective both justifies and has empirically caused exclusion within the debate space as majority white male conceptions of debate become norms creating entrance barriers. WARNER

Ede Warner Jr. is a Professor of Communications and debate coach at the University of Louisiana, "Go Homers, Makeovers or Takeovers? A Privilege Analysis of Debate as a Gaming Simulation.” 2013.

More often than not, talk about privilege in debate is relegated mostly to economic and occasionally gender- or race-based discussions. Refocused recruiting efforts and accomplishments like Urban Debate Leagues and Women’s Caucuses at tournaments are addressing more overt concerns in an effort to create more equal playing fields, yet tremendous inequities remain that require explanation. **Over twenty years of various diversity efforts**, especially in CEDA, **have failed** to substantially change the racial, gender, social and economic composition of interscholastic Spolicy debate at its highest levels. **The reason is simple:** privilege extends much further than just acknowledging overt and obvious disparities. Privilege creeps into more subtle, covert spaces, like the essence of why and how people “play the game,”recognizing that the **rules and procedures are created by those carrying** that **privilege.** Snider argues that the greatness of debate as a game is in his belief that it is short on inflexible rules and long on debatable procedures. However, if procedures are *functionally* not debatable and begin to look more like participation requirements than starting points of discussion, the quality of the game, is “not as successful and well-designed” (Snider, 1987, p. 123). Privilege envelopes both substantive and stylistic procedures, increasing the likelihood that supposedly debatable conventions become rigid norms, preventing achievement of a “more thoughtful” game and **creat**ing **entrance barriers**to successful participation. Here’s how. Snider (1987) says that evaluation of a “**winning” procedural[s]** argument **occur**s **through the lenses of** determining which procedures best facilitate **achieving** the **goals of** the **debate** activity**.** Snider offers three such goals: 1) education of the participants; 2) discussion of important issues in the resolution; and 3) creation of a fair contest. He concedes that some may be missing. Of course,interested **participants with lesser privilege might select different goals as more important**, such as having a voice to discuss the topic through the perspective of their social concerns, **even if this perspective doesn’t fit** nicely **with** some of the **other goals. More often than not, the creation of a “fair contest” is given an absolute priority** relative to other goals and justifies **ignoring** attempts to achieve **other** game **objectives.** At least one implicit goal deserves mention: incorporation of the cultural and social values of the participants. It makes sense that the **like-minded values of the largest participating class will dominant** procedural and **rule development** of a game simulation. Cultural and social values may appear to have little or no relationship to the first three goals of debate. But in fact, the **cultural and social values will in many ways dictate the meaning of** Snider’s goals. What types of education do the participants’ value? Who decides what the important issues are—the participants? The communities most directly related to the topic? Do cultural and social values privilege any notions of “fairness”? Cultural and social background surely impacts each of these areas tremendously. If there are cultural or social disagreements over **what constitutes “education,”** what “issues” are important, **or what is “fair,”** then privilege plays a much larger role in game development than has been acknowledged to date.

#### “Fairness” is not an absolute truth—it differs for different people and glosses over differences in power dynamics. Delgado

Delgado 92 [Richard Delgado, (Charles Inglis Thomson Professor of Law, University of Colorado. J.D, University of California at Berkeley, “ESSAY SHADOWBOXING: AN ESSAY ON POWER”, 77 Cornell L. Rev. 813, Lexis)]

**We have** cleverly **built power's view of** the **appropriate** standard of **conduct into the** very **term fair.** 41 Thus, the stronger party is able to have his way and see himself as principled at the same time. 42 Imagine, for example, a man's likely reaction to the suggestion that subjective considerations -- a woman's mood, her sense of pressure or intimidation, how she felt about the man, her unexpressed fear of reprisals if she did not go ahead 43 -- ought to play a part in determining whether the man is guilty of rape. Most men find this suggestion offensive; it requires them to do something they are not accustomed to doing. "Why," they say, "I'd have to be a mind reader before I could have sex with anybody?" 44 "Who knows, anyway, what internal inhibitions the woman might have been harboring?" And "what if the woman simply changed her mind later and charged me with rape?" 45 What we never notice is that women can "read" men's minds perfectly well. The male perspective is right out there in the world, plain as day, inscribed in culture, song, and myth -- in all the prevailing narratives. 46 These narratives tell us that men want and are entitled [\*820] to sex, that it is a prime function of women to give it to them, 47 and that unless something unusual happens, the act of sex is ordinary and blameless. 48 We believe these things because that is the way we have constructed women, men, and "normal" sexual intercourse. 49 Notice what the objective standard renders irrelevant: a downcast look; 50 ambivalence; 51 the question, "Do you really think we should?"; slowness in following the man's lead ; 52 a reputation for sexual selectivity; 53 virginity; youth; and innocence. 54 Indeed, only a loud firm "no" counts, and probably only if it is repeated several times, overheard by others, and accompanied by forceful body language such as pushing the man and walking away briskly. 55 Yet society and law accept only this latter message (or something like it), and not the former, more nuanced ones, to mean refusal. Why? **The "objective" approach is not** inherently **better or more fair.** Rather, **it is accepted because it embodies the sense of the stronger party,** who centuries ago found himself in a position to dictate what permission meant. 56 **Allowing ourselves to be drawn into reflexive**, predictable **arguments about** administrability, **fairness,** stability, and ease of determination **points us away from what** [\*821] **really counts: the way** in which **stronger parties have managed to inscribe their views** and interests **into "external" culture,** so that we are now enamored with that way of judging action. 57 **First, we read our values and preferences into the culture; 58 then we pretend to consult that culture** meekly and humbly **in order to judge our own acts.** 59 A nice trick if you can get away with it.

#### Texts like the resolution should not be viewed from an objective lens – meaning is subjective and inherently shaped by racism. Shome

Raka Shome, doctoral candidate in the Speech Communication Department, University of Georgia, Athens, 96

(www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1468-2885.1996.tb00119.x).

In the paper, I thus argue for the importance of a postcolonial perspective for rhetorical studies. Postcolonialism, which is a critical perspective that primarily seeks to expose the eurocentrism and imperialism of western discourses (both academic and public),2 has significantly influenced a wide range of fields across the humanities such as sociology, anthropology, education, literature, cultural studies, and even some areas in communication such as mass communication and development communication. However, the field of rhetorical studies has not adequately recognized the critical importance of a postcolonial perspective. By working from a postcolonial perspective, I argue that **as we engage in** **rhetorical understandings of texts**, or produce rhetorical theories, **it is important to place the texts** that we critique or the theories that we produce **against a larger backdrop of** neocolonialism and **racism, and interrogate to what extent these discourses and our own perspectives on them reflect the contemporary global politics of (neo)imperialism.** I believe that in today's world, **when people are constantly discriminated against** by virtue of their skin color, or by virtue of their belonging to "other worlds." **to avoid the issues of racism** and neocolonialism in our critical politics is to "avoid questions concerning ways in which we see the world; it **is to remain imprisoned** ... **by conditioned ways of seeing** ... without the self-conscious-ness that must be the point of departure for all critical

### A2 – Speaking for Others [1:10]

1. **TURN:** I’m just transmitting Derrek Bell’s performance—he wrote Space Traders not me. Look around at the room, there are literally no Black debaters. That means that I’m the only vehicle for a discussion about the performance. It’s a question of whether we introduce unique perspectives in the debate space or arbitrarily exclude them based on a certain debater’s identity.
2. Would you rather I read some abstract ethics that re-entrench the problems of whiteness, or would you rather I acknowledge my position and read a position that’s actually impactful in the debate space. Obviously it’s not ideal for me to be the one reading Space Traders – it would be better if we had Derrek Bell himself – but clearly that’s not an option.

#### Only be recognizing privilege can white people reach the brink of subjectivity. Wilderson

Wilderson 8 (Frank, “Biko and the Problematic of Presence,” in Biko Lives!: Contesting the Legacies of Steve Biko, p. 102)

**Even if** these **White radicals had been persuaded** by Biko and Black Consciousness **that the** essential **nature of the antagonism was** not capitalism but **anti-Blackness** (and no doubt some had been persuaded), **they could not have been persuaded to organize in a** **politically masochistic manner**; that is, against the concreteness of their own communities, their own families, and themselves, rather than against the abstraction of “the system”—the targetless nomenclature preferred by the UDF. **Political masochism would indeed be ethical but would also bring them to the brink of the abyss of their own subjectivity**. They would be embarking upon a political journey the trajectory of which would not simply hold out the promise of obliterating class relations and establishing an egalitarian socius (what less articulate and more starry-eyed White activists in the United States refer to as “vision”), but they would be embarking upon a journey whose trajectory Frantz Fanon called “the end of the world.”22 The “new” world that class-based political “vision” is predicated on (i.e., the dictatorship of the proletariat) isn’t new in the sense that it ushers in an unimaginable episteme; it is really no more than a reorganization of Modernity’s own instruments of knowledge. But a world without race, more precisely, a world without Blackness, is truly unimaginable. Such a world cannot be accomplished with a blueprint of what is to come on the other side. It must be undone because, as Biko, Fanon, and others have intimated, it is unethical, but it cannot be refashioned in the mind prior to its undoing. **A political project such as this**, **whereby the only certainty is uncertainty and a loss of all of one’s coordinates**, **is not the kind of political project Whites could be expected to meditate on**, agitate for, theorize, or finance. And though it might not be the kind of project that Blacks would consciously support, it is the essence of the psychic and material location of where Blacks are. Caught between a shameful return to liberalism and a terrifying encounter with the abyss of Black “life”— caught, that is, between liberalism and death—some White activists took up the banner of socialism, others espoused a vague but vociferous anti-apartheidism, and most simply worked aimlessly yet tirelessly to fortify and extend the interlocutory life of “the ANC’s long-standing policy of deferring consideration of working class interests . . . until after national liberation had been achieved.”23

#### Not speaking for other reflects blame and maintains the oppression of others – speaking for other is necessary and good. Sells

Laura Sells, Instructor of Speech Communication at Louisiana State University, 1997, “On Feminist Civility: Retrieving the Political in the Feminist Public Forum”  
**In her recent article, "The Problems of Speaking For Others," Linda Alcoff points out the ways in which this retreat rhetoric has actually become an evasion of political responsibility.** Alcoff's arguments are rich and their implications are many, but one implication is relevant to a vital feminist public forum.The retreat from speaking for others politically dangerous because it erodes public discourse. **First, the retreat response presumes that we can, indeed, "retreat to a discrete location and make singular claims that are disentangled from other's locations."** Alcoff calls this a "false ontological configuration" in which we ignore how our social locations are always already implicated in the locations of others. **The position of "not speaking for others" thus becomes an alibi that allows individuals to avoid responsibility and accountability for their effects on others. The retreat, then, is actually a withdrawal to an individualist realm, a move that reproduces an individualist ideology and privatizes the politics of experience.** **As she points out, this move creates a protected form of speech in which the individual is above critique because she is not making claims about others. This protection also gives the speaker immunity from having to be "true" to the experiences and needs of others**. As a form of protected speech, then, "not speaking for others" short-circuits public debate by disallowing critique and avoiding responsibility to the other. Second, the retreat response undercuts the possibility of political efficacy. **Alcoff illustrates this point with a list of people--Steven Biko, Edward Said, Rigoberta Menchu--who have indeed spoken for others with significant political impact. As she bluntly puts it,** both collective action and coalition necessitate speaking for others.

### A2 – Afro-pessimism [1:20]

Wilderson is a post-fiat advocacy—fiat is illusory. Society does not get burned down—empirically denied. Performance—this just shows why your performance was insincere—I’m just asking for the judge to read black science fiction, to imagine new futures.

#### Their use of social death and absolute dereliction as epistemological frameworks is bankrupt and debilitating and doesn’t accurately describe black life. Moten

Fred Moten [Professor of Black Studies and Poetry @ Duke University] 2k8, “The Case of Blackness”, Criticism, Volume 50, Number 2, Spring, Project Muse, Accessed: 11/5/11, OG)

So I'm interested in how the ones who inhabit the nearness and distance between Dasein and things (which is off to the side of what lies between subjects and objects), **the ones who are attained or accumulated unto death even as they are always escaping the Hegelian positioning of the bondsman, are perhaps best understood as the extra-ontological, extra-political constant—a destructive, healing agent**; a stolen, transplanted organ always eliciting rejection; a salve whose soothing lies in the abrasive penetration of the merely typical; an ensemble always operating in excess of that ancient juridical formulation of the thing (Ding), to which Kant subscribes, as that to which nothing can be imputed, **the impure, degraded, manufactured (in)** [End Page 186] **human who moves only in response to inclination, whose reflexes lose the name of action.** At the same time, this dangerous supplement, as the fact out of which everything else emerges, is constitutive. It seems to me that **this special ontic-ontological fugitivity of/in the slave is what is revealed as the necessarily unaccounted for in Fanon**. So that in contradistinction to Fanon's protest, **the problem of the inadequacy of any ontology to blackness**, to that mode of being for which escape or apposition and not the objectifying encounter with otherness is the prime modality, **must be understood in its relation to the inadequacy of calculation to being in general**. Moreover, **the brutal history of criminalization in public policy, and at the intersection of biological, psychological, and sociological discourse, ought not obscure the already existing ontic-ontological criminality of/as blackness.** Rather, blackness needs to be understood as operating at the nexus of the social and the ontological**, the historical and the essential.** Indeed, as the ontological is moving within the corrosive increase that the ontic instantiates, it must be understood that what is now meant by ontological requires special elucidation. **What is inadequate to blackness is already given ontologies. The lived experienced of blackness is**, among other things, **a constant demand for an ontology of disorder, an ontology of dehiscence, a para-ontology whose comportment will have been (toward) the ontic or existential field of things and events. That ontology will have had to have operated as a general critique of calculation even as it gathers diaspora as an open set—or as an openness disruptive of the very idea of set—of accumulative and unaccumulable differences, differings, departures without origin, leavings that continually defy the natal occasion in general even as they constantly bespeak the previous**. This is a Nathaniel Mackey formulation whose full implications will have never been fully explorable.12 What Fanon's pathontological refusal of blackness leaves unclaimed is an irremediable homelessness common to the colonized, the enslaved, and the enclosed. This is to say that what is claimed in the name of blackness is an undercommon disorder that has always been there, that is retrospectively and retroactively located there, that is embraced by the ones who stay there while living somewhere else. Some folks relish being a problem. As Amiri Baraka and Nikhil Pal Singh (almost) say, **"Black(ness) is a country" (and a sex) (that is not one).**13 Stolen life disorders positive value just as surely as it is not equivalent to social death or absolute dereliction.

Social Death cannot explain the nuances of slavery or black life in general. Brown

Vincent BROWN [PROF OF history & African American Studies] 2k9, “Social Death and Political Life in the Study of Slavery,” http://history.fas.harvard.edu/people/faculty/documents/brown-socialdeath.pdf)

But this was not the emphasis of Patterson’s argument. As a result, those he has inspired have often conflated his exposition of slaveholding ideology with a description of the actual condition of the enslaved. **Seen as a state of being, the concept of social death is ultimately out of place in the political history of slavery. If studies** of slavery **would account for the outlooks and maneuvers of the enslaved as an important part of that history, scholars would do better to keep in view the struggle against alienation rather than alienation itself.** To see social death as a productive peril entails a subtle but significant shift in perspective, from seeing slavery as a condition to viewing enslavement as a predicament, in which **enslaved Africans and their descendants never ceased to pursue a politics of belonging, mourning, accounting, and regeneration.** In part, the usefulness of social death as a concept depends on what scholars of slavery seek to explain—black pathology or black politics, resistance or attempts to remake social life? For too long, debates about whether there were black families took precedence over discussions of how such families were formed; disputes about whether African culture had “survived” in the Americas overwhelmed discussions of how particular practices mediated slaves’ attempts to survive; and scholars felt compelled to prioritize the documentation of resistance over the examination of political strife in its myriad forms. But of course, because slaves’ social and political life grew directly out of the violence and dislocation of Atlantic slavery, these are false choices. And we may not even have to choose between tragic and romantic modes of storytelling, for history tinged with romance may offer the truest acknowledgment of the tragedy confronted by the enslaved: it took heroic effort for them to make social lives. There is romance, too, in the tragic fact that although scholars may never be able to give a satisfactory account of the human experience in slavery, they nevertheless continue to try. **If scholars were to emphasize the efforts of the enslaved more than the condition of slavery, we might at least tell richer stories about how the endeavors of the weakest and most abject have at times reshaped the world. The history of their social and political lives lies between resistance and oblivion, not in the nature of their condition but in their continuous struggles to remake it. Those struggles are slavery’s bequest to us.**

#### Ontological Fatalism Wrong — anti-blackness *isn’t* a structural antagonism. Hudson 13

Hudson 13 — Peter Hudson, Senior Lecturer in Politics at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, 2013 (“The state and the colonial unconscious,” Social Dynamics, Volume 39, Number 2, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Taylor & Francis Online, p. 265-266)

Thus the self-same/other distinction is necessary for the possibility of identity itself. There always has to exist an outside, which is also inside, to the extent it is designated as the impossibility from which the possibility of the existence of the subject derives its rule (Badiou 2009, 220). But although the excluded place which isn’t excluded insofar as it is necessary for the very possibility of inclusion and identity may be universal (may be considered “ontological”), its content (what fills it) – as well as the mode of this filling and its reproduction – are contingent. In other words, the meaning of the signifier of exclusion is not determined once and for all: the place of the place of exclusion, of death is itself over-determined, i.e. the very framework for deciding the other and the same, exclusion and inclusion, is nowhere engraved in ontological stone but is political and never terminally settled. Put differently, the “curvature of intersubjective space” (Critchley 2007, 61) and thus, the specific modes of the “othering” of “otherness” are nowhere decided in advance (as [end page 265] a certain ontological fatalism might have it) (see Wilderson 2008). The social does not have to be divided into white and black, and the meaning of these signifiers is never necessary – because they are signifiers. To be sure, colonialism institutes an ontological division, in that whites exist in a way barred to blacks – who are not. But this ontological relation is really on the side of the ontic – that is, of all contingently constructed identities, rather than the ontology of the social which refers to the ultimate unfixity, the indeterminacy or lack of the social. In this sense, then, the white man doesn’t exist, the black man doesn’t exist (Fanon 1968, 165); and neither does the colonial symbolic itself, including its most intimate structuring relations – division is constitutive of the social, not the colonial division. “Whiteness” may well be very deeply sediment in modernity itself, but respect for the “ontological difference” (see Heidegger 1962, 26; Watts 2011, 279) shows up its ontological status as ontic. It may be so deeply sedimented that it becomes difficult even to identify the very possibility of the separation of whiteness from the very possibility of order, but from this it does not follow that the “void” of “black being” functions as the ultimate substance, the transcendental signified on which all possible forms of sociality are said to rest. What gets lost here, then, is the specificity of colonialism, of its constitutive axis, its “ontological” differential. A crucial feature of the colonial symbolic is that the real is not screened off by the imaginary in the way it is under capitalism. At the place of the colonised, the symbolic and the imaginary give way because non-identity (the real of the social) is immediately inscribed in the “lived experience” (vécu) of the colonised subject. The colonised is “traversing the fantasy” (Zizek 2006a, 40–60) all the time; the void of the verb “to be” is the very content of his interpellation. The colonised is, in other words, the subject of anxiety for whom the symbolic and the imaginary never work, who is left stranded by his very interpellation.4 “Fixed” into “non-fixity,” he is eternally suspended between “element” and “moment”5 – he is where the colonial symbolic falters in the production of meaning and is thus the point of entry of the real into the texture itself of colonialism. Be this as it may, whiteness and blackness are (sustained by) determinate and contingent practices of signification; the “structuring relation” of colonialism thus itself comprises a knot of significations which, no matter how tight, can always be undone. Anti-colonial – i.e., anti-“white” – modes of struggle are not (just) “psychic”6 but involve the “reactivation” (or “de-sedimentation”)7 of colonial objectivity itself. No matter how sedimented (or global), colonial objectivity is not ontologically immune to antagonism. Differentiality, as Zizek insists (see Zizek 2012, chap- ter 11, 771 n48), immanently entails antagonism in that differentiality both makes possible the existence of any identity whatsoever and at the same time – because it is the presence of one object in another – undermines any identity ever being (fully) itself. Each element in a differential relation is the condition of possibility and the condition of impossibility of each other. It is this dimension of antagonism that the Master Signifier covers over transforming its outside (Other) into an element of itself, reducing it to a condition of its possibility.8

Psychoanalysis results in fatalism, passivity, and inaction. Gordon

Gordon (Psychotherapist Paul, Psychoanalysis and Racism: The Politics of Defeat, Race Class 2001 42: 17)

The postmodernists' problem is that they cannot live with dis appointment. All the tragedies of the political project of emancipation ± the evils of Stalinism in particular ± are seen as the inevitable product of men and women trying to create a better society. But, rather than engage in a critical assessment of how, for instance, radical political movements go wrong, they discard the emancipatory project and impulse itself. The postmodernists, as Sivanandan puts it, blame modernity for having failed them: `the intellectuals and academics have fled into discourse and deconstruction and representation -- as though to interpret the world is more important than to change it, as though changing the interpretation is all we could do in a changing world'. 58 To justify their ¯ight from a politics holding out the prospect of radical change through self-activity, the disappointed intellectuals find abundant intellectual alibis for themselves in the very work they champion, including, in Cohen's case, psychoanalysis. What Marshall Berman says of Foucault seems true also of psychoanalysis; that it offers `a world-historical alibi' for the passivity and helplessness felt by many in the 1970s, and that it has nothing but contempt for those naive enough to imagine that it might be possible for modern human kind to be free. At every turn for such theorists, as Berman argues, whether in sexuality, politics, even our imagination, we are nothing but prisoners: there is no freedom in Foucault's world, because his language forms a seamless web, a cage far more airtight than anything Weber ever dreamed of, into which no life can break . . . There is no point in trying to resist the oppressions and injustices of modern life, since even our dreams of freedom only add more links to our chains; how ever, once we grasp the futility of it all, at least we can relax. 59 Cohen's political defeatism and his conviction in the explanatory power of his new faith of psychoanalysis lead him to be contemptuous and dismissive of any attempt at political solidarity or collective action. For him, `communities' are always `imagined', which, in his view, means based on fantasy, while different forms of working-class organisation, from the craft fraternity to the revolutionary group, are dismissed as `fantasies of self-suf®cient combination'. 60 In this scenario, the idea that people might come together, think together, analyse together and act together as rational beings is impossible. The idea of a genuine community of equals becomes a pure fantasy, a `symbolic retrieval' of something that never existed in the ®rst place: `Community is a magical device for conjuring something apparently solidary out of the thin air of modern times, a mechanism of re-enchantment.' As for history, it is always false, since `We are always dealing with invented traditions.' 61 Now, this is not only non sense, but dangerous nonsense at that. Is history `always false'? Did the Judeocide happen or did it not? And did not some people even try to resist it? Did slavery exist or did it not, and did not people resist that too and, ultimately, bring it to an end? And are communities always `imagined'? Or, as Sivanandan states, are they beaten out on the smithy of a people's collective struggle? Furthermore, all attempts to legislate against ideology are bound to fail because they have to adopt `technologies of surveillance and control identical to those used by the state'. Note here the Foucauldian language to set up the notion that all `surveillance' is bad. But is it? No society can function without surveillance of some kind. The point, surely, is that there should be a public conversation about such moves and that those responsible for implementing them be at all times accountable. To equate, as Cohen does, a council poster about `Stamping out racism' with Orwell's horrendous prophecy in 1984 of a boot stamping on a human face is ludicrous and insulting. (Orwell's image was intensely personal and destructive; the other is about the need to challenge not individuals, but a collective evil.) Cohen reveals himself to be deeply ambivalent about punitive action against racists, as though punishment or other ®rm action against them (or anyone else transgressing agreed social or legal norms) precluded `understand ing' or even help through psychotherapy. It is indeed a strange kind of `anti-racism' that portrays active racists as the `victims', those who are in need of `help'. But this is where Cohen's argument ends up. In their move from politics to the academy and the world of `discourse', the postmodernists may have simply exchanged one grand narrative, historical materialism, for another, psychoanalysis. 62 For psychoanalysis is a grand narrative, par excellence. It is a theory that seeks to account for the world and which recognises few limits on its explanatory potential. And the claimed radicalism of psycho analysis, in the hands of the postmodernists at least, is not a radicalism at all but a prescription for a politics of quietism, fatalism and defeat. Those wanting to change the world, not just to interpret it, need to look elsewhere.

Psychoanalysis only explains individual decisions—not applicable to social experiences

Gordon (Psychotherapist, Paul, Psychoanalysis and Racism: The Politics of Defeat, Race Class 2001 42: 17)

The problem with the application of psychoanalysis to social institu tions is that there can be no testing of the claims made. If someone says, for instance, that nationalism is a form of looking for and seeking to replace the body of the mother one has lost, or that the popular appeal of a particular kind of story echoes the pattern of our earliest relationship to the maternal breast, how can this be proved? The pioneers of psychoanalysis, from Freud onwards, all derived their ideas in the context of their work with individual patients and their ideas can be examined in the everyday laboratory of the therapeutic encounter where the validity of an interpretation, for example, is a matter for dialogue between therapist and patient. Outside of the con sulting room, there can be no such verification process, and the further one moves from the individual patient, the less purchase psycho analytic ideas can have. Outside the therapeutic encounter, anything and everything can be true, psychoanalytically speaking. But if every thing is true, then nothing can be false and therefore nothing can be true.

### A2 – Sci-fi Genre = Racist [0:48]

**First,** Sci-fi might be racist, but afrofuturism is a sub-genre of Sci-fi that specifically revolves around Blackened experiences and hope.

**Second,** this is just inherency supporting the AFF. Racism is terrible—endorse the AFF so that afrofuturism becomes a more acknowledged and followed sub-genre of Sci-fi.

**Third,** this is just empirical proof for the AC. These people who endure racism and continue to write science fiction are exemplars of the politics of survival we endorse.

**Fourth,** this is synonymous to saying since STEM is sexist we should stop doing science altogether. Obviously you don’t reject an entire domain based on one component of it. These are the kind of tactics of whiteness that try to displace Black progress. We should just try to change science fiction instead of rejecting it.

**Fifth,** this is just a reason

#### Sci-Fi is becoming more inclusive. Leonard

Leonard, Elisabeth Anne. Race and ethnicity in science fiction. na, 2003

Other **recent sf novels revolve around racial and cutural identity issues, suggesting that the genre is moving towards an opening up of its past insularity**, parallel to what happened with women writers in the1970s.Hopkinson’s Brown Girl in the Ring (1998) recounts a Toronto where whites and middle and upper-class people have abandoned the inner city to poverty, crime and a barter economy; the protagonist, Ti-Jeanne, uses African-Caribbean magic to ﬁght the drug lord of the city. Kathleen Ann Goonan’s The Bones of Time (1996) draws on the beliefs and history of the Polynesian peoples who settled in Hawaii, and her characters come from the Asian-Hawaiian-white ethnic mix of the islands; her other novels about nanotechnology also include African-American and Caribbean characters. In The Diamond Age (1995), Neal Stephenson sets his future of nanotechnology in China and a world where people of all races and national origins have spread out across the globe into new tribes. Confucianism exists side by side with a neo-Victorian culture and an urban scenario of sophisticated weapons and lawlessness. **Recent sf ﬁlms and television shows have also been less homogeneously white**; one episode of Star Trek: Deep Space Nine had the black Captain Sisko in an alternate world and personality where he wrote sf which he could not publish because no one believed that a black captain could exist.20 **Science ﬁction is a genre which is continually evolving, and as it encompasses a wider range of writers and readers it will reach a point where writing from or about a racial minority is neither subversive nor unusual but rather one of the traits which makes it a powerful literature of change.**

### A2 - Policymaking bad

Self-reflexivity—we define a new way of policy simulation.

All of my cards are reasons for why simulation are good—Womack (we need to create new possibilities or we’re doomed to cultural reproduction)

#### Afrofuturism is a prerequisite productive frameworks and vocabularies for analyzing government policies – it’s a crucial first step. Taylor-Stone[[1]](#footnote-1)

**Afrofuturism creates a space** for those from the Black Diaspora **to explore issues in the present and how they will manifest in the future**. As Michah Yongo points out, just as the language used in Orwell’s 1984 has been used to frame the debate around increasing government surveillance, **black science fiction can provide a new language to address the increasingly complicated frameworks of discrimination.** If we are able to name these frameworks in the same way we recognise Big Brother when we see him, **it is the first step in being able to dismantle them**. In this sense, **Afrofuturism provides a lot more to the black experience than simple escapism**, silver Dashikis and pyramid-shaped spaceships, although I will always have time for that too

#### Bell combines legal knowledge and fantastic frameworks to urge government action in Space Traders. Rutledge

Rutledge, Gregory E. "Futurist Fiction & Fantasy: The Racial Establishment." Callaloo 24, no. 1 (2001): 236-252.

Neither attention nor criticism has been a stranger to Derrick A. **Bell**, Jr., **[is] the first Black author to** **combine** specific **legal objectives with** **FFF [Futurist Fiction & Fantasy]**.31 Long known for his ideas concerning critical race theory, Bell took Black FFF in a new direction. Bell **[he] combined his legal wit and analysis with fantastic allegories and fables to argue that racism is not a transient social condition fading to nothingness, but an indelible problem the government should address as such** (Greenhouse 7). A unique form of legal advocacy, Bell’s quasi-fiction novel, Faces At the Bottom of the Well: The Permanence of Racism (1992), unites law and FFF. While **some of the fables** are normative fictional dialogues conveying various viewpoints on issues concercning race, two of them **use fantastic frameworks whose plots renew the debates about forced recolonization and voluntary separatism that have long been present within society.** “Afrolantica” is a story about the sudden and inexplicable surfacing of a lost continent in the Atlantic Ocean where conditions prevent anyone but Blacks from remaining, even when they use protective gear. African Americans are confronted with the question of whether to self-expatriate themselves en masse to escape the legacy of racism. **In “Space Traders,” Bell creates a plot extrapolating from the goal of the American Colonization Society.** In the 19th century, this organization sought to solve the race problem by recolonizing all free African Americans, a plot later denounced as a plan to further entrench slavery by removing its most trenchant opponents. In Bell’s 20th-century speculative fiction makeover, extraterrestrials offer the United States a panacea for its social, economic, and environmental problems in exchange for its AfricanAmerican population. African Americans would be expatriated to a celestial destination and unknown end. Bell has produced other quasi-fictional works of a less fantastic nature. The most recent, Afrolantica Legacies (1998), extends from the Afrolantica tale; it has not been as well received as its predecessor (Lewis 30).

### A2 - Black nihilism

1. You are discounting the efforts of prior civil rights activists like MLK
2. We co-opt your offense because we struggle except within the system which justifies the **perm:** the net benefit is the incremental reform of the AC even if the majority is garbage
3. We allow everybody to partake—not everyone can sacrifice their entire life for the ALT
4. **Perm:** We can imagine a world in which we rebel against the system and use that towards our politics of survival.
5. Either fiat is illusory and you do nothing or the alternative is just my AFF

### A2 – Afro K

#### The Prefix Afro- is necessary for self-identification and expressing different cultural views based on social location. Gonzalez

Juan-Pablo Gonzalez, “In Defense of the “Afro” Prefix in Contemporary Modern Art.” 8/21/2013. http://archived.thisisafrica.me/visual-arts/detail/19974/in-defence-of-the-afro-prefix-in-contemporary-african-art

#### Zora Neal Hurston (1891 – 1960), folklorist, anthropologist, and author during the time of the Harlem Renaissance When artists choose to embrace and use the Afro prefix, their usage of the prefix is not invalidated because of the failure of the art criticism arena to see beyond current manifestos, nor is it invalidated by the critical arena’s attempt to define new work through existing paradigms. Creativity is at times suffocated by critical review, but critics should not be allowed unchallenged forums in which they continue to create predicates for Afro- art, based on qualification to existing art movements. These are lazy, vapid attempts to describe the work of African artists based on tangential and elemental similarities in the works and to whatever existing manifesto is being cross-referenced. The artists must be vigilant in defining the work for themselves and only the artists can know the true exegesis of their own work. Afro-declaration of work is not an optional, philosophical consideration, toyed with in a capricious manner by artists to arrest the imagination; it is rather an existentially-weighted requirement of any African artist and those who preface their work in this way understand this. The need for self-identity and self-identity exploration, for the African, is as great today as it has always been and always will be. Even if the subject matter of the work created by an African artist isn’t topically African, his or her perspective is as such that there are anthropological differences in the understanding of the world and its mechanics, and that contribution is valuable. While it is vehemently true, that the world would continue to be what it was without black African art, art would not remain unscathed by the disappearance of the Afro-perspective. The Afro-perspective is not about the physicality of the art medium, itself being somehow fundamentally different under the artistic auspices of the African; it is about the reading and interpretation of artistic planes, artistic spaces, and artistic modalities being different due to the African’s unique interpretation of it, in response to how he or she views the world in relation to his or her social condition in it. Afro-declaration does not destroy or restrict artistic creativity—likewise the public and critics are not the determiners of how the artist’s work affects culture. Artists who re-imagine existing manifestos are still contributing to culture. The second element in explaining why African art is prefaced with the prefix ‘Afro’ is the altered psychological non-black-African perception of a work. While the outcome of the work would be a projection of African experience, the understanding of the work by the non-African mind changes the meaning the art occupies in cultural space. It can be thought of in terms of comparing a spider and a butterfly. A spider indelibly changes an environment and the psychological action within it, in a way that a butterfly does not—we know that for many people a spider will carry a set of transferred fears, misunderstandings and misinformation about its nature, and these fears influence our perception of the spider. But the butterfly, our view of which is unencumbered by such psychological pressures, is universally accepted as a beautiful entity to be embraced. This is how African art is different because it arouses curiosity in a way that is asymmetrical to that of other works. My argument has been framed around an American historical perspective, but this should not invalidate what I have said to you my fellow Africans in Diaspora because I have not included your corner of the world. My usage of the American historical context is a didactic tool because the American historical example is paradigmatic of the oppression the African body and conscious faces all over this planet, and it is also representative of our collective responses to it at any given point in history regardless of geographical local. If you are an African, you need only look at your daily life to see that your social experiences in XYZ country are a mirror to my social experiences in the United States, regardless of the degrees of nuances between our experiences. The historical context is always the most important aspect of understand anything in our world. One aspect of African Diaspora culture that reflects this idea is that of the Ghanaian idea of “Sankofa”, which translates as “Reach back and get it.” This principle is not only a reverence of our ancestors’ work but it also an idea critical to our existential viability. Nothing exists without a seed, what we see today is rooted and anchored by yesterday, and it is to yesterday we reach for the knowledge and understanding that helps us to go forward. What we are doing today is continuing to nurture the seeds planted by our ancestors so that somewhere down the line we will see the harvest we deserve, so continue to be African-conscious in all of your work and in every aspect of your life because future generations are depending on the records we create. All the historical writing excerpts by American black literati and the banner used in this essay have come from the anthology .

#### Words have different meanings in different contexts; the 1AC is a shift to ameliorate the negative meaning of words. Butler

Judith Butler [Professor of Rhetoric and Comparative Literature – University of California-Berkeley], Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative p. 38. 1997.

This story underscores the limits and risks of resignification as a strategy of opposition. I will not propose that the pedagogical recirculation of examples of hate speech always defeats the project of opposing and defusing such speech, but I want to underscore the fact that such terms carry connotations that exceed the purposes for which they may be intended and can thus work to afflict and defeat discursive efforts to oppose such speech. Keeping such terms unsaid and unsayable can also work to lock them in place, preserving their power to injure, and arresting the possibility of a reworking that might shift their context and purpose. That such language carries trauma is not a reason to forbid its use. There is no purifying language of its traumatic residue, and no way to work through trauma except through the arduous effort it takes to direct the course of its repetition. It may be chat trauma constitutes a strange kind of resource, and repetition, its vexed but promising instrument. After all, to be rained by another is traumatic: it is an act that precedes my will, an act that brings me into a linguistic world in which I might then begin to exercise agency at all. A founding subordination, and yet the scene of agency, is repeated in the ongoing interpellations of social life. This is what I have been called. Because I have been called something, I have been entered into linguistic life, refer to myself through the language given by the Other, but perhaps never quite in the same terms that my language mimes. The terms by which we are hailed arc rarely the ones we choose (and even when we try to impose protocols on how we are to be named, they usually fail); but these terms we never really choose arc the occasion for something we might still call agency, the repetition of an originary subordination for another purpose, one whose future is partially open.

### A2 - Ballot commodification

#### This isn’t a personal story

1. You commodify the ballot
2. Everything is performative, so everything commodifies so the disad is non-unique

#### Personal storytelling is key to spur rights movements—proven empirically by movements in the 20th century

Kay and Smith 04, Schaffer, Kay, Emerita Professor in Gender Studies and Social Inquiry; Smith, Sidonie, Mary Fair Croushore Professor of the Humanities. Biography, “Conjunctions: Life Narratives in the Field of Human Rights,” Project Muse, Biography, Volume 27, Number 1, Winter 2004, pp. 1-24 (Article) l 4 Published by University of Hawai'i Press '77:): DOI: 10.1353/bio.2004.0039 http://engl646-srikanth.wikispaces.umb.edu/file/view/Schaffer+and+Smith.pdf

By the last decades of the century, the modernist language of rights had become a lingua franca for extending—sometimes explicitly, sometimes implicitly—the reach of human rights norms, not everywhere, but across an increasingly broad swath of the globe**. Post-World War II struggles for national self-determination and equality for women, indigenous peoples, and minorities within nation-states led to the rise of local and transnational political movements and affiliations—movements for Black and Chicano civil rights, women’s rights, gay rights, workers’ rights, refugee rights, disability rights, and indigenous rights among them—all of which have created new contexts and motivations for pursuing personal protections under international law. In each instance, personal storytelling motivated the rights movement.** These collective movements have gained momentum and clarified agendas for action through attachment to the goals of the Universal Declaration and attendant discourses, events, and mechanisms. **The collective movements have also argued for new claims, pressing for reinterpretations of rights frameworks, and lobbying for Covenants and Declarations that expand the kinds of rights that require recognition and protection. In the 1960s, group action and advocacy led to the adoption of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination** (1969). **In the 1970s, women’s and feminist activism led to the adoption of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women** (1981**). In the 1990s, trade union and indigenous advocacy led to the adoption of the International Labor Organization Convention 169 concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples (1991) and the Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People** (1993). Together, these latter two instruments, if and where ratified, could significantly alter the parameters of rights discourse in that they acknowledge and support group rather than individual rights, encompassing the aspirations of indigenous and minority peoples for self-determination and their claims to culture, language, religion, and land rights, sometimes in opposition to states’ claims of sovereignty**. In the early 1990s, rights activists lobbied for the Convention on the Rights of the Child. In this evolving culture of rights, personal witnessing plays a central role in the formulation of new rights protections, as people come forward to tell their stories in the contexts of tribunals and national inquiries. In its role as an advocate for peaceful forms of civic engagement within nations and across nations, the U**nited **Nations itself has generated audiences for local stories muted within the dominant cultures of member states through its “decade” strategy; that is, through the targeting of a particular group and the concentration of attention on its issues for a decade, as in the International Decade for Women** (1975–1984) **and the International**

### A2 – Theory

#### Cross-Apply the Reid-Brinkley EV from the 1AC: Pedagogically T/Theory detract the debate from the voices of the minority and reinforce the voice of major powerbrokers.

#### Passing off subjective conceptions of fairness as objective both justifies and has empirically caused exclusion within the debate space as majority white male conceptions of debate become norms creating entrance barriers. Warner

Ede Warner Jr. is a Professor of Communications and debate coach at the University of Louisiana, "Go Homers, Makeovers or Takeovers? A Privilege Analysis of Debate as a Gaming Simulation.” 2013.

More often than not, talk about privilege in debate is relegated mostly to economic and occasionally gender- or race-based discussions. Refocused recruiting efforts and accomplishments like Urban Debate Leagues and Women’s Caucuses at tournaments are addressing more overt concerns in an effort to create more equal playing fields, yet tremendous inequities remain that require explanation. **Over twenty years of various diversity efforts**, especially in CEDA, **have failed** to substantially change the racial, gender, social and economic composition of interscholastic Spolicy debate at its highest levels. **The reason is simple:** privilege extends much further than just acknowledging overt and obvious disparities. Privilege creeps into more subtle, covert spaces, like the essence of why and how people “play the game,”recognizing that the **rules and procedures are created by those carrying** that **privilege.** Snider argues that the greatness of debate as a game is in his belief that it is short on inflexible rules and long on debatable procedures. However, if procedures are *functionally* not debatable and begin to look more like participation requirements than starting points of discussion, the quality of the game, is “not as successful and well-designed” (Snider, 1987, p. 123). Privilege envelopes both substantive and stylistic procedures, increasing the likelihood that supposedly debatable conventions become rigid norms, preventing achievement of a “more thoughtful” game and **creat**ing **entrance barriers**to successful participation. Here’s how. Snider (1987) says that evaluation of a “**winning” procedural[s]** argument **occur**s **through the lenses of** determining which procedures best facilitate **achieving** the **goals of** the **debate** activity**.** Snider offers three such goals: 1) education of the participants; 2) discussion of important issues in the resolution; and 3) creation of a fair contest. He concedes that some may be missing. Of course,interested **participants with lesser privilege might select different goals as more important**, such as having a voice to discuss the topic through the perspective of their social concerns, **even if this perspective doesn’t fit** nicely **with** some of the **other goals. More often than not, the creation of a “fair contest” is given an absolute priority** relative to other goals and justifies **ignoring** attempts to achieve **other** game **objectives.** At least one implicit goal deserves mention: incorporation of the cultural and social values of the participants. It makes sense that the **like-minded values of the largest participating class will dominant** procedural and **rule development** of a game simulation. Cultural and social values may appear to have little or no relationship to the first three goals of debate. But in fact, the **cultural and social values will in many ways dictate the meaning of** Snider’s goals. What types of education do the participants’ value? Who decides what the important issues are—the participants? The communities most directly related to the topic? Do cultural and social values privilege any notions of “fairness”? Cultural and social background surely impacts each of these areas tremendously. If there are cultural or social disagreements over **what constitutes “education,”** what “issues” are important, **or what is “fair,”** then privilege plays a much larger role in game development than has been acknowledged to date.

#### “Fairness” is not an absolute truth—it differs for different people and glosses over differences in power dynamics. Delgado

Delgado 92 [Richard Delgado, (Charles Inglis Thomson Professor of Law, University of Colorado. J.D, University of California at Berkeley, “ESSAY SHADOWBOXING: AN ESSAY ON POWER”, 77 Cornell L. Rev. 813, Lexis)]

**We have** cleverly **built power's view of** the **appropriate** standard of **conduct into the** very **term fair.** 41 Thus, the stronger party is able to have his way and see himself as principled at the same time. 42 Imagine, for example, a man's likely reaction to the suggestion that subjective considerations -- a woman's mood, her sense of pressure or intimidation, how she felt about the man, her unexpressed fear of reprisals if she did not go ahead 43 -- ought to play a part in determining whether the man is guilty of rape. Most men find this suggestion offensive; it requires them to do something they are not accustomed to doing. "Why," they say, "I'd have to be a mind reader before I could have sex with anybody?" 44 "Who knows, anyway, what internal inhibitions the woman might have been harboring?" And "what if the woman simply changed her mind later and charged me with rape?" 45 What we never notice is that women can "read" men's minds perfectly well. The male perspective is right out there in the world, plain as day, inscribed in culture, song, and myth -- in all the prevailing narratives. 46 These narratives tell us that men want and are entitled [\*820] to sex, that it is a prime function of women to give it to them, 47 and that unless something unusual happens, the act of sex is ordinary and blameless. 48 We believe these things because that is the way we have constructed women, men, and "normal" sexual intercourse. 49 Notice what the objective standard renders irrelevant: a downcast look; 50 ambivalence; 51 the question, "Do you really think we should?"; slowness in following the man's lead ; 52 a reputation for sexual selectivity; 53 virginity; youth; and innocence. 54 Indeed, only a loud firm "no" counts, and probably only if it is repeated several times, overheard by others, and accompanied by forceful body language such as pushing the man and walking away briskly. 55 Yet society and law accept only this latter message (or something like it), and not the former, more nuanced ones, to mean refusal. Why? **The "objective" approach is not** inherently **better or more fair.** Rather, **it is accepted because it embodies the sense of the stronger party,** who centuries ago found himself in a position to dictate what permission meant. 56 **Allowing ourselves to be drawn into reflexive**, predictable **arguments about** administrability, **fairness,** stability, and ease of determination **points us away from what** [\*821] **really counts: the way** in which **stronger parties have managed to inscribe their views** and interests **into "external" culture,** so that we are now enamored with that way of judging action. 57 **First, we read our values and preferences into the culture; 58 then we pretend to consult that culture** meekly and humbly **in order to judge our own acts.** 59 A nice trick if you can get away with it.

#### Communal norms institute racist practices and make disadvantaged voices unheard. Academic debate must change now. Smith

Smith, Elijah, “A Conversation in Ruins: Race and Black Participation in Lincoln Douglas Debate.” 2013.

It will be uncomfortable, it will be hard, and it will require continued effort but the necessary step in fixing this problem, like all problems, is the community as a whole admitting that such a problem with many “socially acceptable” choices exists in the first place. **Like all systems of social control, the reality of racism in debate is constituted by the singular choices that institutions, coaches, and students make[.]** on a weekly basis. I have watched countless rounds where competitors attempt to win by rushing to abstractions to distance the conversation from the material reality that black debaters are forced to deal with every day. One of the students I coached, who has since graduated after leaving debate, had an adult judge write out a ballot that concluded by “hypothetically” defending my student being *lynched* at the tournament. Another debate concluded with a young man defending that we can kill animals humanely, “just like we did that guy Troy Davis”. **Community norms would have competitors do intellectual gymnastics or make up rules to accuse black debaters of breaking to escape hard conversations but** as someone who understands that experience, **the only constructive strategy is to acknowledge the reality of the oppressed, engage** the discussion from the perspective of authors who are black and brown, **and** then **find strategies to deal with the issues** at hand. It hurts to see competitive seasons come and go and have high school students and judges spew the same hateful things you expect to hear at a Klan rally. A student should not, when presenting an advocacy that aligns them with the oppressed, have to justify why oppression is bad. **Debate is not just a game, but a learning environment with liberatory potential.** Even if the form debate gives to a conversation is not the same you would use to discuss race in general conversation with Bayard Rustin or Fannie Lou Hamer, that is not a reason we have to strip that conversation of its connection to a reality that black students cannot escape.

#### SF solves their education claims – research indicates it has pedagogical benefits. Reynolds 77[[2]](#footnote-2)

Some **techniques** utilized by these teachers **included building models of cities of the future, seing earth through alien eyes, and inventing a planet or spaceship for human use.** It appears that **there are as many** basic **purposes for** utilizing **science fiction in the classroom as there are teachers with innovative ideas.** **Many** of the **teachers** surveyed **mentioned the application of science fiction to** the study of **the social foundations of education, history, economics, and** the **social sciences**. They found that the **science fiction short story or novel is particularly adaptable to pedagogical objectives**. An analysis of the science fiction short story or novel reveals usually that the theme is developed in the context of an action-filled back- ground, meaningful situations, and characters which the classroom teacher can utilize in discus- sions and written assignments. What are some of these basic themes?

### A2 – Coal Disad

#### The current ecological crisis is rooted in whiteness and the protections that exist for white subjects and the vulnerabilities of black subjects. Dunaway

Finis Dunaway [associate professor of History @ Trent University 2k8], “Gas Masks, Pogo, and the Ecological Indian: Earth Day and the Visual Politics of American Environmentalism,” American Quarterly, Vol. 60, No. 1

Rather than revealing absolute shifts—*from* liberal reform *to* individual responsibility—the environmental politics of this period demonstrate instead how these themes complemented one another. Moral appeals about individual responsibility reinforced the expanding power of the regulatory state—and vice versa. In both cases, pollution and other environmental issues were seen as constituting a "crisis," a visible, definable problem that could be "solved"—on the one hand, through changes in individual behavior, and, on the other, through technical fixes initiated by the federal government. In both cases, **environmentalism was portrayed as a movement devoted to** a specific entity—**the "environment"—and not a broad-based effort to bring about social justice**. Issues of race, class, and power, therefore, had nothing to do with the quest for a cleaner environment. Neutral experts employed by the environmental policy apparatus, together with individuals engaged in voluntary action around the nation, would participate in a consensus-building crusade to rid America of pollution.[37](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/american_quarterly/v060/60.1dunaway.html) By placing visual images in dialogue with public policy and subaltern perspectives, we can better understand the limits to American environmentalism as it developed during this period. To be sure, some environmental activists sought to forge connections with other social struggles, to link their cause to the antiwar movement or to the fight against systematic racism and poverty in the inner cities. For the most part, however, mainstream environmental organizations adhered to a narrow conception of the "environment." These groups worried about the presence of lead in the ambient environment and pushed for clear air measures, to make sure that people like Sarah and Lucy would not have to wear gas masks in the future. Nevertheless, they **did not participate in the contemporaneous struggle against lead poisoning**, a debilitating condition most commonly found in the inner city, among children who **[End Page 90]** lived in dilapidated housing units with peeling lead paint. Rather than making connections between this environmental hazard and questions of social justice, rather than forging links with grass roots and community organizations, the major environmental groups simply ignored it and did not view it as constituting an environmental issue.[38](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/american_quarterly/v060/60.1dunaway.html) The mass media, moreover, found no place for African Americans in the environmental movement. Media coverage of Earth Day described the overwhelming whiteness of the event's participants and implied that pollution was irrelevant to the plight of minority groups. NBC News interviewed Michael Harris, an African American student at Howard University, who dismissed Earth Day as a "calculated political move by the established order in this country to divert attention from the pressing problems of black people." Other media reports emphasized similar criticisms of environmentalism, including the pointed words of Mayor Richard G. Hatcher of Gary, Indiana, who argued that this newfound "concern with environment has done what George Wallace was unable to do: distract the nation from the human problems of the black and brown American, living in just as much misery as ever."[39](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/american_quarterly/v060/60.1dunaway.html) These comments, much like the demonstration staged against the San Jose State car burial, reveal an important dimension of environmental discourse during this time period. Earth Day participants, and environmental activists more generally, claimed to speak for the general public and to represent all Americans. Their vision of environmentalism imagined the movement as unifying everyone in a common struggle against pollution. Yet **left unspoken**, and almost never acknowledged by mainstream groups at the time, **was how their conception of environmentalism obscured divisions among the American population and elided the ways that economic and racial inequalities influenced the experience of environmental risk**. Even as the media provided some space for criticisms of Earth Day, this same coverage also ignored the efforts of subaltern communities to form an alternative vision of environmentalism. In St. Louis, for example, an organization called Black Survival performed a series of skits on Earth Day dramatizing the environmental problems of the inner city: high rates of air pollution that led to asthma, emphysema, and other respiratory ailments; inadequate city services, such as infrequent trash removal that resulted in rat and roach infestations; and a frightening epidemic of lead poisoning among children in the city's poorest neighborhoods. Black Survival in fact grew out of a larger campaign against lead poisoning, a struggle coordinated by Ivory Perry, Freddie Mae Brown, and other civil rights activists in conjunction with scientists based at Barry Commoner's Center for the Biology of Natural Systems at Washington University. The Earth **[End Page 91]** Day skits featured poignant moments, including a father learning that his baby has died of lead poisoning, and voiced radical sentiments, including chants of "Black Power" and "Power to the People." Although newspapers in St. Louis described these skits and other actions, Black Survival went unmentioned in national media coverage of Earth Day.[40](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/american_quarterly/v060/60.1dunaway.html) It is worth asking why this form of environmental theater did not receive media attention, while white people wearing gas masks or smashing or burying automobiles became central to mainstream views of the environmental cause. As the growing literature in the field of environmental justice studies demonstrates, subaltern groups did not separate environmental struggles from the broader quest for social justice. Black Survival's conception of environmentalism thus did not fit within the dominant understanding of the movement as a cause that voiced the concerns of all Americans and that described its constituency as a classless, undifferentiated group. By enacting their position as an oppressed segment of the population, by revealing the particular environmental conditions of the inner city, problems, they emphasized, that were located within larger structures of power, the members of Black Survival posed an important challenge to the self-conception of mainstream environmental organizations.[41](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/american_quarterly/v060/60.1dunaway.html) The sociologist Nathan Hare, writing in *Black Scholar* during the same month as the Earth Day celebration, reminded readers that the term "'ecology' was derived" from the Greek word *oikos* "meaning 'house.'" Environmental activists adopted the language of ecology, but they seemed, Hare suggested, to have forgotten this etymology—or perhaps they were simply unwilling to concern themselves with the "household and neighborhood environment of blacks." Indeed, mainstream environmental groups did not join in the struggle against lead poisoning and even refused to define it as an environmental problem. The journalist Jack Newfield, who described lead poisoning as "an environmental disease of the urban ghettos," suggested why the mass media and mainstream organizations neglected to confront this "silent epidemic." "It seems," he wrote, "that nothing is real to the media until it reaches the white middle class. . . . Then it is a crisis."[42](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/american_quarterly/v060/60.1dunaway.html) The photograph of Sarah and Lucy represented the crisis of air pollution reaching the middle class, as did the posters that warned of poisoned breast milk. These latter images also became linked to another struggle, one that suggested the possibility of viable interaction between mainstream and subaltern environmentalisms. In 1969, as the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee (UFWOC) struggled to get union recognition and bargaining rights for its primarily Latino membership, the group also began to focus on farmworkers' exposure to pesticides. The UFWOC had earlier called for a grapeboycott in order to link consumers to producers and put pressure on growers to accept its demands. As part of this boycott campaign, the UFWOC began to stress that grapes posed health threats to consumers as well as workers. The UFWOC suggested that all bodies were porous, that both consumers and workers could suffer from the "economic poisons" sprayed on grapes. In publicizing this dimension of the boycott, the UFWOC emphasized that nursing mothers could pass pesticides on to their babies. The vulnerable female body again became a central motif in environmental politics.[43](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/american_quarterly/v060/60.1dunaway.html) While the grape boycott signaled a promising collaboration, it also revealed the limitations of mainstream environmentalism. For the most part, these organizations did not give their support to the UFWOC. Even as mainstream environmental groups called for the banning of pesticides such as DDT, they focused on how these toxic chemicals affected wildlife populations and did not form alliances with farmworker organizations. The UFWOC viewed its campaign against pesticides as part of a larger struggle against the inequalities and power relations faced by Latino workers on a daily basis. Mainstream environmental groups did not understand how the pesticide issue was embedded in these larger, structural frameworks. Moreover, even though the UFWOC played an important role in removing DDT from the fields, the replacements for this pesticide—known as organophosphates—were in fact even more hazardous to workers (although not to wildlife). Nevertheless, mainstream organizations did not view the health of workers as an environmental issue and so, with few exceptions, did not worry about the dangers of pesticide replacements. As both the lead poisoning and pesticide issues illustrate, the dominant strand of American environmentalism refused to consider power relationships among different groups of Americans and detached itself from larger struggles for social justice. By defining environmental problems in a narrow fashion, by focusing on technical solutions, and by refusing to ally itself with other social movements, the environmental cause became an interest group that seemed to speak primarily for white, privileged Americans.[44](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/american_quarterly/v060/60.1dunaway.html) **The technical solutions proposed by** environmental groups and **policymakers assumed that "everyone breathes the same air and drinks the same water**." As one critic of mainstream environmentalism explained, referencing the widespread use of the gas mask image: "If air pollution continues to get worse, the rich will produce the gas masks but they will not be the first to have to buy them." Indeed, the **legislation** that emerged from this period **failed to consider how racial and economic inequalities determined rates of environmental risk.** The generalized air and water pollution measures also created other problems: **the proliferation of toxic waste dumps**, located primarily **in minority communities**. "The primary legacy of the environmental movement and its resulting regulations," the historian Andrew Hurley writes, "was not so much a reduction of industrial waste but a transfer of wastes from water and air to the land." Because **white privilege was inscribed into the American landscape, these apparently race-neutral policies** in fact only **worked to racialize the distribution of environmental risk even further**, forcing "aggrieved racial minorities," as George Lipsitz explains, to "encounter higher levels of exposure to toxic substances." To a certain extent, these new policies did help clean up the nation's air and water, but **they** also **exacerbated environmental inequities by increasing the levels of pollution in minority neighborhoods**, the spaces so often ignored by mainstream environmentalists and hidden from view by media coverage of the environmental crisis.45

### A2 - U.S. Focus Bad

**Extend Amuwo:** The AFF criticizes the global pillaging of African countries for resources such as Uranium. We invade these countries with no concern for their inhabitants such as Nambia which has been torn up by Western powers.

### A2 – Cap K

We prove the reason that Black people are sold. The State views certain bodies as fungible—that they can be traded for transient goods. This is not based on capitalism; this is based on entrenched systems of racism. The AC and the K are definitely not competitive, so **perm** do the AFF and endorse the performance. Our performance critiques capitalism— Bell describes the US: “the country was in dire straits. Decades of conservative, laissez-faire capitalism had emptied the coffers.”

**Also** fiat is illusory, the alternative doesn’t actually matter, just the response the performance produces. We’re winning our method that Afrofuturism/science-fi is key to changing the audience in a way that they will actually do something about capitalism.

### A2 - Abstraction

The performance criticizes abstraction that is not grounded in real-world solutions that target minority populations, that’s where Gleason Golightly is criticized by Bell for basing his arguments on ‘morality’ and the willingness of the President to balance benefits of the Trade against the burdens for Blacks.

#### Bell’s racial realism is very real-world. Curry

Dr. Tommy J. Curry, “We Who Must Fight in the Shade: Derrick Bell’s Philosophy of Racial Realism as the basis of a Black Politics of Disempowerment.”

This paper intends to convey four theoretical contributions to our current understandings of racism in the post-civil rights era. First, **I want to question** the mainstay tradition of Black social/political philosophy and **race theory that continues to celebrate liberalism as a vehicle for racial progress.** **Following** the work of Derrick **Bell, I maintain that this is in a very real sense an unjustifiable romanticization of the Civil Rights Era**, specifically the effect of Brown v. Board on American race relations. Second, I want to clarify Derrick’s position on liberalism and a means through which Black political theorists can distance themselves from this dogma of integrationism which I term “conceptual disengagement.” Third, I argue that this disengagement would allow Black scholars to better understand the relationship that W.E.B. DuBois points out to Black Americans in accepting minuscule political privileges when the consequence of such luxuries is the furthering of American imperialism and the capitalist exploitation of the darker races the world over. Lastly, I am interested in presenting a contrasting political theory rooted in the disempowerment of white supremacist institutions and structures of American society. **In stark contrast to** the **ideal theories** of integration and ethical theories that ask the oppressed to assume, despite historical reason or contemporary consciousness, that their racial oppressors will freely surrender their power and position, **disempowerment divests the normative expectations and ameliorative possibilities of a political system that** has preserved, perpetuated, **and propagates white supremacy. Bell’s racial realism demystifies the illusion and rhetorical stratagem of the Civil Rights era moralism.** As a political theory, **disempowerment**, building on the realism conveyed by DuBois and elaborated upon by Bell, **indicts** the **political structures**, the courts, the political economics, and the public consciousness that sustains white dominance despite the alleged opening up of American society through desegregation. How can Black scholars, race theorists, and social justice theorists continue to demand allegiance to the structures that have continued to subjugate, when it is the political repression—the erasure of the racial and economic inequality that has resulted from America’s civil rights epoch—that continues present itself as an obstacle to the awareness of America’s racist social stratifications. Is this the task of Black political theory, to criticize only in vain hope of inclusion? Is it the task of the Black political theorist to reinvent and give their oppressors a language, a lexicon, to describe subjugated racial peoples deemed irrelevant? Or is it the task of the Black political theorist to use those deaths, the murders of young Black boys, like Travyon Martin, as the catalyst for conversations with whites who ignore, rationalize, or eulogize this injustice? **Racial realism and its outgrowth of disempowerment is not a radical theorization of political advocacy, rather it is simply the articulation of Black experiences that have sought to “take away” from their oppressors the means and subservience that denies and leaves unchallenged the actual (real) instruments of racist oppression.**

**Our Womack evidence is great:** The method of the AC creates a different form of abstraction that’s based on empirical circumstances of minority populations. Afrofuturism acknowledges that Black bodies are condemned to sufferance by whites but decides to transcend that suffering through re-imagining the present in the space of futurity. The AFF creates a good form of ‘abstraction’ which impact turns your evidence.

### A2 – Made by White Guy

**First,** even if Afrofuturism was created out of whiteness, that doesn’t mean Afrofuturism functions through whiteness. Afrofuturism is simply the radical re-imagination of current social problems which has been adopted by Black critical race theorists. Since the movement has been blackened, there’s no impact to your argument.

**Second,** Afrofuturism was defined and formed through conversations with Alondra Nelson who is Black. Just because the term was coined by a White man doesn’t mean that the movement ever arose out of Whiteness. The movement arose out of the opinions of Alondra Nelson in the late 1990s.

**Third,** Afrofuturism was actually created in 1992 by Mark Sinker in “Loving the Alien.” That’s a year before Mark Dery wrote “Black to the Future.”

### A2 - Afrofuturism = Outdated/Incoherent

**Extend Womack:** Afrofuturism is about individual transcendence above the problems of the status-quo.

### A2 - Performance bad

**Non-unique:** everything is a performance—this is our framing argument which you have conceded. It’s a question of whether your performance specifically was good—in this case our performance was and yours was not.

### A2 – PIC Trade White People

**First,** this is not a legitimate performance, spreading through a PIC doesn’t convey any effective response in the audience.

**Second,** PICs are a scheme of whiteness-- you’re trying to steal my advocacy and just alter one small part of it. Stop trying to steal the words out of my mouth.

**Third,** empirically denied by the AFF. There’s no world in which we would simply trade white people for resources—Blacks are seen as most fungible and therefore the USFG chooses to sacrifice them.

### A2 - White gate-keeper K

**First,** If I’m winning the role of the ballot, then it’s non-unique. They’re trying to link offense into my ROB and therefore use the ballot to fight anti-blackness. Double bind (a) they don’t link into my ROB and they lose or (b) they do link and they’re also white gate-keepers.

**Second,** it’s important for white people to read Black science fiction too-- even the judge might have a flawed conception of Blackness in America and Sci-fi might resolve these beliefs that they carry. If anything, white people also need to be convinced.

### A2 – Performance not Afrofuturism

We contextualize what empowerment means—that’s our Bell evidence which indicates that we need a politics of survival in which we rebel against the system despite the inability for there ever to be complete racial equality. Even if Gleason Golightly loses the battle to reject the Space Trade, he’s still an empowered individual and an exemplar of what we advocate.

### A2 – Model Minority Myth [1:20]

**First,** we say we stop going to abstractions, that’s definitely key to engaging in this debate in the first place so you should endorse our performance

**Second,** you say that model minority (in the text of the card) solves other forms of racism—that is positing another ontological starting point.

**Third,** we just say we make things better for whites. We think recognizing white privilege is definitely key to solving for other forms of oppression. Every Asian-American person thinks the black/white binary is critical because that is how you trap Asian-Americans. White privilege puts Asian-Americans triangulated between these groups. If we don’t unpack anti-blackness, then we can’t see this. **Ang 15**

Ally Ang [works at Women’s Foundation of California], “Asian Americans Benefit from Black Struggle and We Need to Start Shouldering the Burden.” BGD [Publication for amplifying the voices of queer & trans people of color]. July 30, 2015.

Even though we face problems such as underrepresentation, racial stereotypes, and discrimination, **the racism that we face is inextricably linked to anti-blackness.** You know **the stereotype of Asian Americans being emotionless math geniuses who get perfect SAT scores** and become valedictorians at Ivy League universities? It **formed as a counterpart to the stereotypes of black and brown people as lazy and underachieving.** **Anti-blackness is at the very core of the model minority myth**, and there are countless examples of Asian Americans perpetuating anti-blackness: from Vijay Chokalingam to the murder of Latasha Harlins to when an Asian American fraternity at UC Irvine posted a video featuring its members in blackface.

**So fourth, perm** we radically imagine a future in which Asian-Americans are empowered. The AFF method is definitely not exclusive. Let’s get out of debate jargon and actually think about it. We’re just trying to make a change.

**Fifth,** the Civil Rights Movement didn’t have a queer politics movement, but it obviously still helped in certain ways. Bracketing your focus is not the same thing as reinforcing the binary, we only have 6 minutes to talk and the AC spurred this discussion we wouldn’t have had which is uniquely important.

**Sixth,** Representations always involve tradeoffs, there is not enough time in the AC to talk about every form of oppression. But by explaining the myth of the model minority as distinct from anti-blackness, you weaponize that tradeoff by essentializing each racial group as facing wholly distinct and competitive struggles, leading to oppression Olympics.

Peng

Another implication of **the myth** is that it **promotes anti-black racism**, an idea I hadn’t considered before. When I had those few conversations about race with my siblings I didn’t realize I was being racist. Not that we were trying to defame African Americans, but **we were comparing our lives as Asians to the lives of Blacks.** It didn’t come across to us that **we were internalizing anti-blackness**. **We would say** things like, “well we grew up living with a frugal lifestyle and still managed to get into college, so they can do it too” or **“we don’t get ourselves involved in crime, so they could do the same.”** **Many Asian Americans have come to fear and avoid the stigma of being “different” or “foreign” in a country where whiteness surrounds us. So anti-black sentiment acts as a defense mechanism for us to avoid that stigma.** We may feel that our status of success validates our insecurities of being a minority and places us on a racial hierarchy above other non-Whites, maybe close to or above Whites.

The problem of **these racial stereotypes** is that it **divides different groups of people and puts them in competition against each other.** Additionally, it is wrong and unfair to compare the struggles of different communities. Asian Americans have a different history of oppression from African Americans. Many could argue that the history of oppression for African Americans is much worse than that of Asians or any other minority community. But that is still a juxtaposition of different groups of people. And that is the last thing we want to do. **We could talk about the different magnitudes of suffering of all groups of people, but that should not make the struggles of one race, culture, or ethnicity worse or less worse than another.**

But most importantly, to accept any positive stereotype of one’s own race is to accept a white supremacist system that reinforces a racial hierarchy**. This is absolutely detrimental to both Asian American communities and other racial communities**

### A2 – Ableism

AFF makes mistake in answering the ALT solves the AFF

* Not clear what the link is at the end of the debate
* The 1AR and 2AR are spent on reasons the particular performance is an effective one
* No disad to the PERM

Get to the perm with 10 seconds left

* Not extending enough link defense
* If afro-futurist is ableist, then risk of link is sufficient

Definitely need solvency deficit

* If you just go for perm/no link/solvency deficit

### Sci-fi bad

### Decadence critique

### Derrek Bell bad

### Counter-science fiction (counter-performance)

### Read satire

### Truth-testing good

### Counter-roll of the ballots

### Afro-futurism bad

### Tuck & Yang K

### Middle passage metaphors bad

CASE NEGS against AFF investigating middle passage

### Invisibility arguments

Biopolitics (invisible committee)

### Undercommons K

### Accessibility Arguments (storytelling = inaccessible, etc)

### Essentializing Disad (Moten + Hayes)

### A2 – Black Framework
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